AN EXAMINATION

OF THE

Right Hon. Edmund Burke's

REFLECTIONS

ON THE

REVOLUTION in FRANCE,

INTERSPERSED WITH

HINTS OF IMPROVEMENT

OF THE

NEW FREE CONSTITUTION OF THE FRENCH.

By FRANCIS STONE, M.A. F.S.A.

RECTOR OF COLD NORTON, ESSEX.

He who is first in his own cause, seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh, and searcheth him. King Solomon.

Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu? Horace.

LONDON:

Sold by G. G. J. and J. Robinson, Pater-noster Row: J. Johnson, St. Paul's Church-yard: Scatcherd and Whitaker, Ave-Maria Lane: C. Stalker, Stationer's Court, Ludgate-street: F. Knight, St. James's-street: Champante and Whitrow, Jury-street, Aldgate: C. Norton, Henley: Falkner and Birch, Manchester: Pearson, Wood, and Piercy, Birmingham; and all other Booksellers.

M.DCC.XCII.

Published by the same Author,

POLITICAL REFORMATION,

ON

A LARGE SCALE, &c.

Price TWO SHILLINGS.

A CALL TO THE JEWS,

Price THREE SHILLINGS and SIXPENCE.

AND

A PLAN OF REFORM

IN THE

LEGISLATIVE DELEGATION OF UTOPIA,

Price SIXPENCE.

CONTENTS.

Inſcription to the Biſhop of Autun
Apology to the Public

CHAPTER I.

Midnight oil. Lex talionis. Natural ſuperior to conſtitutional right. Duke of Richmond. Mr. Sheridan. Dr. Price. Juſt encomium on the Society for Conſtitutional Information. Interrogatory reſpecting Mr. Burke's attack on the Revolution Society. Goliath. David. Siſera. Crow pens and gooſe quills. All Saints Day. All Fools Day. Month of November. Suicide. Mr. Burke's prophylactic medicine for it. Mr. Burke's wiſdom in appearing as an author on the firſt day of a month. Monthly Reviewers, and their victory, - - - - - *Page* 5--9

CHAPTER II.

Excluſion of miniſters of ſtate from the National Aſſembly worthy of imitation. Liberty incompatible with the union of the legiſlative and executive powers in the ſame individuals. Mr. Burke's Atheiſts practice morality and overturn ſuperſtition and tyranny. Juſtification of the congratulatory addreſs of the Revolution Society. Selfiſh men of the world incapable of forming an idea of the diſ-

intereſted patriotiſm of Chriſtian politicians. Authority of individuals preferable in ſome caſes to ſtate authority. Mr. Burke more of an Œdipus than a Davus. Acknowledgment of the obligations of the public to Mr. Burke for his patriotic conduct in two inſtances. Diminution of the influence of the executive impracticable without a previous reform of the legiſlative power, *Page* 10—21.

CHAPTER III.

Logical defence of an agreement between politics and the pulpit. Political liberty an eſſential branch of Chriſtian morality, and conſequently a fit ſubject of pulpit inſtruction. The apoſtle Paul's intrepid defence of his Roman citizenſhip conſidered, with ſuitable inferences. The governments of Europe founded on immorality. The neceſſity of a reform of the Houſe of Commons on moral principles, and thoſe principles ſpecified. Dr. Price defended from the cenſure of Mr. Burke. Gallio's refuſal to interfere in religious matters recommended to the imitation of civil magiſtrates. Mr. Burke a botaniſt, but miſtakes the garden of nature for an hortus-ſiccus, *Page* 22—34

CHAPTER IV.

Diſcuſſion of the ſubject of elective and hereditary crowns. Radical reform of the Houſe of Commons conſiſtent with, and preſervative of, an hereditary crown. Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that the King on the throne owes his hereditary crown to the election of the people, in the perſons of their repreſentatives. The privy-counſellor ſmells a plot in embrio, and is, in conſequence,

consequence, invested, at the season of maturity, with the office of Accoucheur, - - - *Page* 35--41

CHAPTER V.

Defence of the three fundamental rights of the people of England stated by Dr. Price. Dr. Price's error respecting the acquisition of these rights corrected. Refutation of Mr. Burke's position, that the English nation at the Revolution abdicated the right to elect their kings. Mr. Burke's assertion that the people of England look on the frame of their commonwealth, as it now stands, to be of inestimable value, contradicted by fact. The probability of a misapplication of the public money, proved by reference to a late trial in the court of King's Bench. The Examiner's plan in his 'Political Reformation on a large Scale, &c,' calculated to make the frame of our commonwealth such as it ONCE STOOD, AND OUGHT TO STAND. The Examiner suggests to the Dissenters, that the repeal of the Test Act would be a necessary consequence of a radical reform of the House of Commons, - - - - - - - - *Page* 42—55

CHAPTER VI.

The Examiner vindicates Dr. Price from the censure of Mr. Burke, and proves, that a king is the servant of the people, and that the high-sounding Law-Appellative, Sovereign Lord, implies merely the king's supremacy as first and chief magistrate over all subordinate magistrates. As well king as people bound to obey the law. The crown responsible in the persons of its ministers, and therefore sheltered from immediate responsibility.

No antiquity reſpectable but ſuch as originates in human nature. Britons found their claim to a free conſtitution, not on the principle of inheritance from forefathers, but of birth-right from God their father; and on this principle the Revolutioniſts proceeded, - - - - - *Page* 56--72

CHAPTER VII.

Quere, whether a proviſion for the education of the infant poor in ſchools of religion, morals, and induſtry, be not preferable to civil eſtabliſhments in religion. The French National Aſſembly generous vindicators of religious liberty. Mr. Burke's MERCIFUL rejection of the petition of certain of the clergy and laity, to the Houſe of Commons, for relief from the burthen of ſubſcription to the Thirty-nine Articles, founded on his abſurd, inconſiſtent principle of an ESTABLISHMENT TIGHT, and a TOLERATION LARGE, Mr. Burke's poſition, that a moral politician can be deluſively plauſible, controverted. Mr. Burke's rigour exemplified in his too literal interpretation of the declaration of the Parliament of Paris to their king. Diſcuſſion of Mr. Burke's aſſertion, that the French rebel againſt a mild and lawful monarch. Summum jus ſumma injuria. Mr. Burke's reſiſtance to conceſſion and revolt from protection expoſed. Proved, that Mr. Burke ſhould have annexed to his favourite the Gallican church, the active participle, PILLLAGING, inſtead of the paſſive participle, PILLAGED, - - - - - *Page* 73---81

CHAPTER VIII.

Wiſdom of melting down the three orders into one in the ſtates general. Mr. Burke's unfavourable account

account of the members of the Tiers-etat, and of the repreſentatives of the clergy and nobility. Mr. Burke repreſents the National Aſſembly as governed by the law-members, and they by an oligarchy of degraded nobility. Thoſe of the French nobility, who joined in the deſtruction of their own order, vindicated from the aſperſions of Mr. Burke, and entitled to a badge of merit. To level and to equalize terms ſynonimous. All men equal. Mr. Burke's perverſion of the word uſurpation. The words of the Chancellor of France to be taken in their ſtrict literal ſenſe. No diſtinction between man and man but what ariſes from pre-eminence in integrity. Road to power ought to be open alike to all. The only due and adequate legiſlative repreſentation of a people is univerſal and equal PERSONAL repreſentation. Repreſentation of property abſurd, and would tend to arm the rich with the power to oppreſs the poor. Mr. Burke's aſſertion, that inequality is the characteriſtical eſſence of property, proved to be erroneous. Mr. Burke reſumes his reflections on the Revolution Society. The cauſe of liberty in Britain, to which the example of France is auſpicious, ſtated, - - - *Page* 82--97

CHAPTER IX.

A full anſwer to Mr. Burke's eleven queries reſpecting the annihilation of our monarchy, laws, tribunals, and ancient corporations; geometrical and arithmetical conſtitutions; the vote of the inutility of the Houſe of Lords; the abolition of epiſcopacy; the ſale of the church lands, and the ſale of them to Jews and Jobbers. A Jeſuit's

hopes of the reeſtabliſhment of the power and authority of the church of Rome in England depend on the preſervation of civil eſtabliſhments in religion. Aſinine reſemblance between the tribe of Iſſachar and the people of Britain. The ſaucy French Revolutioniſts kick down the Britiſh idol they were inclined to adore. The Engliſh nation not free while a ſingle individual is debarred of his natural rights of Parliamentary repreſentation and eligibility. The examiner agrees with Dr. Price, that the inequality of our repreſentation is an important imperfection in our conſtitution; but maintains that the inequality of Parliamentary eligibility, and the duration of Parliament beyond a ſingle annual ſeſſion are defects in our conſtitution equally groſs and palpable. Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that our repreſentation is inadequate to all the deſired purpoſes of a repreſentation. Mr. Burke's baſtardy of the Houſe of Lords. No difference between a government by jure divino right and by immutable convention, - - - - *Page* 98—117

CHAPTER X.

A man, when he enters into civil ſociety, does not, as Mr. Burke contends, to ſecure ſome liberty, ſurrender the whole of it. Citation from the Monthly Review for November, 1790. Mr. Burke's aſſertion that ſimple governments are fundamentally defective, founded in error. Mr. Burke's fanciful invention, that the rights of men are in a ſort of MIDDLE, expoſed. The error of Mr. Burke in aſſerting that the rights of men in governments

governments are their advantages. Two highly finiſhed drawings, caricatures; the one by Mr. Burke of an horrid ſpectacle on the beau jour, October 6th, 1789; the other by Monſieur Lally Tollendahl de la caverne des Antropophages. The humanity of the decrees of the National Aſſembly, in favour of the equal rights of men, gives the untruth direct to Tollendahl's drawing. Mr. Burke's tragedy piece unfaithful in two inſtances. Freſh inſtance of Mr. Burke's LIBERAL treatment of the Revolution Society and Dr. Price. Inconſiſtency of the ſorrowful ſenſibility of a certain Britiſh Senator. The confinement of the French king and queen excites different ſenſations in Mr. Burke and the Examiner. The Examiner furniſhes the National Aſſembly with hints of a decree for the prevention of riots. Mr. Burke's SUICIDAL joy. A tragic ſketch of the French queen and her maids of honour in the future act of ſuicide. The Examiner adviſes her againſt it, - - - - - - - - - *Page* 118—136

CHAPTER XI.

The Examiner's gratitude to Mr. Burke for tranſporting him from an horrid ſpectacle to a delightful viſion. Mr. Burke's glowing deſcription of the fair Dauphineſs, calculated to excite the ardour of rapturous emotions in the hearts of his young readers among the men. It produced ſomething of the tickling effervеſcence of an amourous ſenſation in the breaſt of his middle aged Examiner. Buxom widows hearts not ſafe from its magic influence. Its wonderful effect on a young beautiful

beautiful ſpinſter of the Examiner's acquaintance. A long narrative of the ſame. How the young lady rapidly hurried through the pages of Mr. Burke's Reflections till her attention was arreſted by the delightful viſion. How here, her ſpirits exhauſted, ſhe fell into a profound ſleep with Mr. Burke's pamphlet in her hand. How the viſion produced a dream as extraordinary as the moſt extravagant vagaries of Mr. Burke's luxuriant fancy. How ſhe was caught up into the Heathen-Heaven, and ſaw all the gods and goddeſſes, and fell into a ſwoon. Her recovery from it. The jealouſy her ſudden appearance cauſed among the goddeſſes. How, by the aid of Venus, ſhe ſaw Mr. Burke aſtride Pegaſus in his flight to the Morning Star. How ſhe became a favourite with the Queen of love, who holds a long converſation with her, obſerving that ſhe reſembled the fair Dauphineſs in air, ſhape, features, and complexion, and gives orders to her three attiring maids to dreſs her out for conqueſt on her return to earth. How ſhe is conveyed down in the goddeſs's car, driven by the gallant charioteer Cupid, with many other particulars concerning the Ceſtus of Venus, her doves and ſwans, and a deſcription of the car. Laſtly, how ſhe awakes, and the ſequel. The Examiner concludes with a brief account of a ſober matron's remark on Mr. Burke's delightful viſion, - - - - - - - - - *Page* 137--153

CHAPTER XII.

Mr. Burke's automata ſwords. The age of chivalry ſurvives in the perſon of Mr. Burke. Mr. Burke's

Burke's aſſertion, that vice loſt half its evil by loſing all its groſſneſs, a groſs error. The extinction of the feudal ſyſtem of polity deſirable. The truth of the converſe of a propoſition of Mr. Burke aſſerted. Mr. Burke's flouriſhing condition of Europe contradicted. French commerce and the arts not endangered by Mr. Burke's hypothetical IF. Remonſtrance againſt Mr. Burke's exchange of a Proteſtant Rabbin for a Popiſh Archbiſhop. Mr. Burke's objects of awe, affection, duty, reverence, and reſpect, conſidered. Mr. Burke's high-flying notions of the CONSECRATED revenue of the church examined. Mr. Burke the accompliſhed gentleman. Inquiry into Mr. Burke's independency of the church on the crown, and his conſequences of its dependance on any other. Obſervations on Mr. Burke's aſſertion reſpecting the confiſcation of the eſtates of the church. Argumentum ad hominem.—Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that the encreaſing population of a country, and a large quantity of circulating coin, are not certain ſtandards of the mildneſs of its government. Remarks on Mr. Burke's account of the French Nobleſſe in particular, and his ſentiments on the order of nobility in general, - - - - - - - 154--172

CHAPTER XIII.

Mr. Burke's character of the French clergy contraſted with that of one of his anſwerers. The Examiner ſuggeſts a method of turning the lands of the Gallican church to better account than by the ſale of them. Maintained, againſt Mr. Burke, that

that the decorations of churches are expenditures leſs worthy of a wiſe man than ribbands, laces, and national cockades. Intimation of the exemplification of the juſtneſs of Mr. Burke's remark, that eloquence and wiſdom are not inſeparable companions. Defects in the organization of the legiſlative branch of the new French conſtitution, particularly in the affair of repreſentation. Hints for ſupplying theſe defects, by making the repreſentation and eligibility into the National Aſſembly immediate, equal, and univerſal, and the election annual. The conſtituent aſſembly, by their moderation and generoſity, avert the neceſſity of a change in the executive power, which the King by his flight might have otherwiſe incurred. A hint for a new formation of the executive power in the caſe of the king's future abdication of the crown. The king accepts the new conſtitution, and declares his acceptance to foreign courts. The Examiner exhorts kings to voluntarily grant that equal liberty, which has at laſt been ceded by the French King. A word in praiſe of the King of Poland. Juſtification of the excluſion of miniſters of ſtate from the national councils, and of the National Aſſembly's deprivation of the King's prerogative of war. The Examiner juſtifies the National Aſſembly in their neglect of Monſieur Neckar, on account of his attempt to introduce miniſters of ſtate into their legiſlative body.—Examination of Mr Burke's ſentiments on the plan of judicature formed by the National Aſſembly. Improvements and correctives of errors in the ſaid plan ſuggeſted, - - - - *Page* 173—194

CHAP-

CHAPTER XIV.

Examination of Mr. Burke's Reflections on the military eſtabliſhment of the National Aſſembly. The Examiner, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, approves of the National Aſſembly's proceedings in eſtabliſhing ſocial habits between the army and the people. The Examiner ſubmits to the National Aſſembly an outline of military arrangements, conſiſting of the conſolidation of the national and municipal armies, forming jointly with the people at large an univerſal national militia of armed citizens. Examination of Mr. Burke's reflections on the organization of the French financial eſtabliſhment. His extraordinary aſſertion, that the revenue of the ſtate is the ſtate combated and expoſed. Mr. Burke's poſition, that the proſperity and improvement of nations generally increaſe with the increaſe of their revenues, contradicted by experience. Improvements in French finance reſpecting reſources and ſavings, to be drawn from proper eccleſiaſtic, military, colonial, commercial, and naval arrangements, together with ſuch as relate to a proviſion for the poor. Concluſion of the Examination of Mr. Burke's Reflections. They tend, contrary to his intent, to accelerate that bleſſed event, a radical parliamentary reform in Britain, which the French Revolution is calculated to produce. Curious anecdote conſequent on the publication of the Examiner's "Political Reformation on a large Scale," &c. Archbiſhop Laud and Biſhop Williams. Mr. Burke and his Examiner. Port, Tokay, and Burgundy. - - *Page* 195—212

ERRATA.

Apology, line 7, for *Sir John Rous*, read *George Rous, Esq.*—Page 10, line 9, dele *the.*—P. 31, l. 4. for *of*, read *for.*—P. 46. l. 5 from the bottom, for *it to*, read *to it.*—P. 62. l. 10. for *furies* read *furiis.*—P. 74. l. 14. dele the *comma*, and put a *full stop*, and begin the next word with a great *P.*—l. 15, dele the *full stop*, and put a *comma*, and begin the next word with a little *c.*—l. 9 from the bottom, before *mark* insert *to.*—P. 75. l. 15. dele *the.*—P. 76. l. 11. for *unskackled*, read *unshackled.*—l. 12. for *unmanacred*, read *unmanacled.*—P. 87. l. 8 from the bottom, dele the *comma* after *longo.*—P. 96. l. 18. for *stronlgy* read *strongly.*—P. 107. l. 15. for *became*, read *become.*—P. 113. l. 7. from the bottom, for *national* read *natural.*—l. 6. ditto, dele the *s* in *points.*—P. 124. l. last, for *their*, read *in the.*—P. 132. l. 5 from the bottom, for *secleſtum*, read *sceleſtum.*—P. 148. l. 4 from the bottom, for *attre*, read *attire.*—P. 156. l. 14. for *Signeuires*, read *Seigneuries.*—P. 158. l. 12. after *species* read *to.*—P. 165. l. 15. dele '*he.*'—l. 16. after *only*, read *He.*—P. 188. l. 8. for *amneſtry*, read *amneſty.*

TO

THE BISHOP OF AUTUN,

IN GRATEFUL TESTIMONY

OF HIS EXTRAORDINARY MERITS,

AS AN APOSTOLIC BISHOP,

AND AN UNIVERSAL PATRIOT,

AS A CHRISTIAN POLITICIAN,

PHILOSOPHER AND PHILANTHROPIST,

THIS WORK

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED,

BY HIS MOST OBEDIENT HUMBLE SERVANT,

THE AUTHOR.

APOLOGY TO THE PUBLIC.

SINCE I took the following Examination in hand, which a variety of avocations would not permit me to purſue, without frequent and ſometimes long intervals, ſo many writers have produced ſatisfactory anſwers to Mr. BURKE's REFLECTIONS, beſides thoſe noticed by me, and in particular Sir BROOKE BOOTHBY, Mr. CHRISTIE, and Sir JOHN ROUS, that I was more than once inclined to lay aſide my pen, and decline obtruding my ſentiments on my countrymen. But the reflection that a political work, not dangerous on account of the *argumentative* part of it, but calculated to lead the thoughtleſs aſtray by the captivating charms of a florid ſtyle, and by the celebrity of the name of the author, diſtinguiſhed as an orator in the Britiſh ſenate, and as an occaſional miniſter and ex-miniſter, could not meet too many opponents, determined me to perſevere. Beſides, I thought it poſſible I might caſually animadvert on objectionable paſſages in Mr. Burke's letter, overlooked by former anſwerers, or not ſo fully expoſed in every point of view as I could wiſh. Laſtly, an additional cogent motive for perſeverance aroſe from the conſideration, that my Examination is interſperſed with hints, which, I humbly

hope, may not prove entirely uſeleſs in improving as well our own, as the new free conſtitution of the French, which ſo juſtly claims and attracts the admiration and applauſe of all who are not merely indolent well-wiſhers to, but active promoters of the civil, political, and religious liberty, and happineſs of the whole human race.

It is needleſs to add more than a firm truſt, that the public will receive theſe efforts in the ſupport of this great and good cauſe, beneficial to man, and conſequently acceptable to God, with a candour equal to the philanthropy which gave birth to them.

AN EXAMINATION, &c.

CHAPTER I.

Midnight oil.—Lex talionis.—Natural ſuperior to conſtitutional right.—Duke of Richmond.—Mr. Sheridan.—Dr. Price.—Juſt encomium on the Society for Conſtitutional Information.—Interrogatory reſpecting Mr. Burke's attack on the Revolution Society.—Goliath.—David.—Siſera.—Crow pens and gooſe quills.—All Saints Day.—All Fools Day.—Month of November.—Suicide.—Mr. Burke's prophylactic medicine for it.—Mr. Burke's wiſdom in appearing as an author on the firſt day of a month.—Monthly Reviewers, and their victory.

SIR,

WITHOUT the dull formality of a tedious Preface, I ſhall at once, *ſans ceremonie*, enter on a diſpaſſionate examination of your long expected REFLECTIONS ON THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE, &c. which certainly have coſt you much midnight oil. Whether that midnight oil has been waſted or not, as well the public in this country, and the French people in

general, as the Societies of the Revolution and of Conſtitutional Information, and the French National Aſſembly in particular, muſt determine.

My delay in the publication of this Examination has been occaſioned by ſuch neceſſary avocations, as leave me little leiſure to beſtow on your eſſay, which however is of a nature, and contains matter ſo extraordinary, that my ideas of the duty I owe, not merely to my Fellow-Britons, but to my fellow-creatures at large, would not permit me to paſs it by unnoticed.—I propoſe, Sir, to treat it with a freedom ſimilar to that which you have uſed in diſcuſſing the principles and proceedings of the ſaid Societies and Legiſlative Aſſembly.—*Nec lex eſt juſtior ulla.*

Though moving in the humble contracted ſphere of contented private life; and not, like you, diſtinguiſhed as a public character, yet animated by a well-tempered active zeal to vindicate the natural equal rights of all men; rights which are very conſiſtent with an inequality of property, but rights which you ſeem not to ſufficiently reſpect, I do not altogether deſpair, in the courſe of my ſtrictures, to prove that you, Sir, (the celebrity of whoſe name as a witty florid orator cannot but inſure a rapid ſale of your work,) are one of thoſe "*perſons, who,* "*under the pretext of zeal towards the Revolution* "*and Conſtitution, too frequently wander from their* "*true principles,*" page 2. But when I ſpeak of the Conſtitution, greatly as I reſpect it in its primordial

mordial Saxon purity, let me not be underſtood that it claims my reſpect in thoſe inſtances of its preſent abuſed and very corrupt ſtate, wherein, through the miſchievous intrigues of a long ſucceſſion of deſigning miniſters of the crown, it has departed from its original beautiful ſimplicity, and has ſuperceded thoſe rights which the God of nature has given to mankind, and by which, as by an unerring ſtandard, every political conſtitution ſhould be at firſt formed, and if found defective reformed. —You muſt excuſe me if I particularly examine whether you adhere with any degree of pertinacity to the ſpirit of the eighth and thirteenth articles of the Bill of Rights, viz. "that election of "members of parliament ought to be free; and "that for redreſs of all grievances," &c. "Parliaments ought to be held frequently."— Moreover, if I ſhould detect you in any material miſrepreſentation of our political conſtitution, as derived from our Saxon progenitors, I ſhall take the liberty to expoſe ſuch miſrepreſentation with ſpirit, but without acrimony.

Paſſing by, Sir, with perfect nonchalance and *ſang froid* your *charitable* quere, page 3, "*whether* "*the books ſo charitably circulated*" by the Society for Conſtitutional Information, "*were ever as cha-* "*ritably read*;" as alſo your ſneering ſarcaſtical ſuppoſition, that "*poſſibly ſeveral of them, like goods* "*not in requeſt here, may with you* (the French) "*have found a market*;" with more of the like

ſuper-excellent good-natured rhodomontade, unworthy of a ſerious anſwer, I ſhall only take leave to remind you, that, page 4, "*this poor charitable club*" can boaſt of numbering among its members, the moſt noble Duke of Richmond, and your old, but now diſcarded, friend and ally Mr. Sheridan. If in the plenitude of your worldly wiſdom you cannot admit the univerſally-eſteemed Dr. Price, *multis ille bonis flebilis occidit!* nor your ſaid brother orator, to be "*a man of common judgment, or the leaſt degree of* "*information*," let me beſeech you, Right Honourable Sir! to condeſcend, in the abundance of your *charity*, or out of a principle of politeneſs, and of "*reſpect to nobility*," page 128, to concede that his Grace may be poſſeſſed of a competent ſhare of both. Now, I apprehend, the Duke can "*ſpeak* "*a word in praiſe of the greater part of the pub-* "*lications circulated by that ſociety*," becauſe, in his letter to Colonel Sharman, of the Iriſh Volunteers, he has adopted two of the moſt eſſential principles of a radical reform of the Houſe of Commons, contained in thoſe publications; I mean the principles of annually elected parliaments, and of equal univerſal parliamentary repreſentation.

The ſociety, I doubt not, entertain a moſt *grateful* ſenſe of their *obligations* to your *charitable* lamentation, that "*you*, (the French National Aſſembly) *reſerved the whole ſtock of your eloquent ac-* "*knowledgments for the Revolution Society, when* "*their fellows in the Conſtitutional were, in equity,* "*entitled to ſome ſhare.*"

As in page 4 you ſeem to have cloſed your *charitable* general remarks on this ſociety, their principles, publications, and proceedings, I muſt of neceſſity bid them a final valediction, but not without bearing this my teſtimony, that the ſociety deſerves ſomething better of the community, than that cavalier treatment which they have received from your pen.—Though I do not arrogate to myſelf the gift of prophecy, yet common human foreſight is ſufficient to enable me to prognoſticate, that the time is not far diſtant (and your preſent publication, contrary to your intention, is calculated to haſten the bleſſed event) when the people at large will thankfully acknowledge, becauſe they will reap the fruit of the labours of the ſociety, in preparing their minds by the circulation of tracts of conſtitutional information, for the introduction of that radical reform of the Houſe of Commons, which the people at large experience to be abſolutely neceſſary. They will juſtly appreciate what you undeſervedly depreciate. With you, unhappily, it ſeems, *dulcia ſe in bilem vertunt*, and merits become demerits. To the jaundiced eye of the worldly politician the moſt beautiful tints of nature, particularly ſky-blue, or *liberty* blue, aſſume a yellow hue. As a man of the world, dreading the progreſs, ſlow but ſure, of a complete parliamentary reform, which lays the axe to the root of our political evils, in the deſtruction of miniſterial and ariſtocratic influence in the Houſe of Commons, you drop your ſatirical

rical reflections on the Society of Conſtitutional Information—reflections conſiſting of vague general aſſertions, unſupported by proofs, and, in effect, exclaim, "Reſt, perturbed ſpirits! reſt!" 'and ſeek where you can for a ſanative emplaſtrum to the galling wounds inflicted by my well-directed ſhafts of raillery, ridicule, and cenſure. 'I have other higher game in view, and throwing aſide' (you are fond of tropes and figures) 'my pop-gun againſt a covey of harmleſs little birds, 'take aim with my formidable double-barrelled 'rifle at birds of prey, thoſe vultures, who faſten 'their talons on *hereditary* kingſhip.'

But before I proceed to examine and lament the terrible execution of your wide waſting irony againſt the Revolution Society, I muſt for a moment put this queſtion to you, Why, Sir, as a man not "*unacquainted with the world*," and not "*inexperienced in all its affairs*," have you ſounded the trumpet of civil commotions, or, at the beſt, of popular diſcontents, by commencing an attack againſt the body of Diſſenters in the perſons of ſeveral of the members of the Revolution Society; men, to whom the cauſe of ſocial liberty, whether civil, political, or religious, owes many and great obligations? Do you think they will tamely ſubmit to be the butt of your ridicule without a becoming reſentment?—Ridicule! a very erroneous teſt of truth, and the common refuge of thoſe who are defective in argument. I truſt you will experience

rience from the ſociety that manly reſentment which conſiſts not ſo much in applying the retort courteous, in reſpect of raillery, though you can be eaſily foiled at your own boaſted weapon, as in worſting you in point of argument, a point in which your Reflections are rather deficient, though copiouſly fruitful in words. But

" Words are like leaves, and where they moſt abound,
" Much fruit of ſenſe beneath is rarely found."

It is not impoſſible but, agreeably to the old adage, " The Turk may catch a Tartar." Remember, Sir, for I give you credit, that you are not unread in ſacred hiſtory, that the gigantic Goliath was ſlain by the deſpiſed ſtripling David; nay, Siſera was killed by a *woman*; and laſtly, you, Sir, may not be ignorant, that the author of " *Thoughts on the Public Diſcontents*," was ſilenced by a juſtly renowned literary champion of the ſame ſex. Perchance the ſame lady, or ſome fair ſiſter, may preſume to enter the liſts with you, and with ſucceſs brandiſh her puny crow pen againſt your tremendous gooſe quil, Nay, ſince I wrote the above, the ſame formidable female antagoniſt, Mrs Macaulay Graham, now deceaſed, and her patriotic coadjutrix, Mrs Mary Woolſtonecraft, have defeated you in the fair-fought field of argument.

I intended here to proceed in my Examination of your Reflections, but am for the preſent diverted from my purpoſe, by a ſtrong propenſity to obtrude

a ſecond

a ſecond interrogatory upon you.—What motive, Sir, could induce you, as a gentleman of your profound political ſagacity ventures not on any public tranſaction without a reaſon, to fix on the firſt of November, *All Saints Day*, for the publication of an Eſſay which has ſo much excited the curioſity of the public?—If it had been the offſpring of my own pericranium, I think I ſhould, on reflection, have been ſo aſhamed of that ſmall part of it, which in you has been already ſubject to my criticiſm, that I ſhould rather have ſelected *the firſt of April*, for its public appearance. But probably you *charitably* judged, that Engliſhmen being proverbially in the habit of ſuicide, by ſuſpenſion or immerſion in the gloomy month of November, you could not more agreeably and efficaciouſly divert them from the indulgence of that moping melancholy, which often terminates in a fatal deſpondency, than by iſſuing forth from the preſs on the firſt of that month. Your Eſſay on the Affairs of France cannot but arreſt the attention of the moſt deſpairing mortal, and prevent, at leaſt for a time, his commiſſion of the crime. I am unwilling to ſuppoſe, that you ſallied forth as an author on that day, in compliment to all the *ſaints*-mediators of the Church of Rome, or by way of tacit intimation of a wiſh for the return of the reign of ſuch *ſaints* in this country.—I rather regard the circumſtance as a good omen, that on that *ſaintly* day, you, in your publication, have undeſignedly laid the corner

ſtone

ſtone of that glorious ſuperſtructure, a ſubſtantial and durable Parliamentary Reform; which, by an excluſion of the dependents of the crown from the Houſe of Commons, ſhall emancipate that legiſlative aſſembly from the diſgraceful yoke of miniſterial and ariſtocratic influence, and tend to introduce into it, when annually elected by the free, fair, full, voice of the collective body of the people, a few, at leaſt, of thoſe ſaints, or thoſe of your dreaded "*political men of letters*" in private life, (page 165,) who excel in virtue, and will be honeſt enough to legiſlate for the national welfare only, inſtead of ſacrificing, like hackneyed courtiers and anti-courtiers, like crafty miniſters and ex-miniſters, public intereſt to private emolument.

That you ſhould uſher yourſelf forth to the public on the firſt day of a month, was certainly a very politic contrivance; for by this ſagacious ſtep you advanced a *month's* march a-head of that formidable hoſt of literary purſuers, the authors of the Monthly Review; who, notwithſtanding this advantage, have come up with you, and harraſſed you, and attacked you, and routed you in front, flank, and rear.

CHAPTER II.

Excluſion of miniſters of ſtate from the National Aſſembly worthy of imitation.—Liberty incompatible with the union of the legiſlative and executive powers in the ſame individuals.—Mr. Burke's Atheiſts practice morality, and overturn ſuperſtition and tyranny.—Juſtification of the congratulatory addreſs of the Revolution Society.—Selfiſh men of the world incapable of forming an idea of the diſintereſted patriotiſm of the Chriſtian politicians.—Authority of individuals preferable in ſome caſes to ſtate authority.—Mr. Burke more of an Œdipus than a Davus.—Acknowledgement of the obligations of the public to Mr. Burke for his patriotic conduct in two inſtances.—Diminution of the influence of the executive impracticable, without a previous reform of the legiſlative power.

I Shall now accompany you again to page 4, "*firſt* "*aſſuring you,*" in your own words, page 3, "*that I am not, and that I have never been, a member* "*of thoſe ſocieties,*" (the Revolution Society, and that of Conſtitutional Information) though I ſhould not deem it a diſparagement to my natural dignity as a man, to be admitted a member of both, provided they keep at a diſtance from the equally contemptible parties of profeſſed oppoſitioniſts and miniſterialiſts. Page 4, preſents me with this ſcoffing reflection, that "*the National Aſſembly of France has given importance to theſe gentlemen,* (the Revo-

"lution

"lution Society) *by adopting them, and they return*
"*the favour by extending the principles of the National*
"*Aſſembly.*"—My reflection on your reflection is, the National Aſſembly could not act in a manner more ſuited to the dignity of men, who glory in the characters of univerſal patriots and citizens of the world, than by thanking, in their legiſlative capacity, the Revolution Society, for their congratulatory addreſs; wherein "diſdaining national partialities, "and rejoicing in every triumph of liberty and "juſtice over arbitrary power, they offer to the "National Aſſembly of France, their congratu-"lations on the Revolution in that country, and "on the proſpect it gives to the two firſt kingdoms "in the world, of a common participation in the "bleſſings of civil and religious liberty; adding "their ardent wiſhes of an happy ſettlement of ſo "important a Revolution, and expreſſing the par-"ticular ſatisfaction with which they reflect on the "tendency of the glorious example given in France "to encourage other nations to aſſert the *unalienable* "rights of mankind, and thereby to introduce a "general reformation in the governments of Europe, "and to make the world free and happy."—See Dr. Price's motion, and conſequent unanimous reſolution of the ſociety.

It is probable alſo the former may have deemed the latter not undeſerving of their grateful acknowledgments, for the following unexceptionable toaſt, which breathes the genuine ſpirit of univerſal phi-

lanthropy

ſanthropy, and which I think originated in the ſaid Dr. Price, namely,—" An alliance between France " and Great Britain, for perpetuating peace, and " making the world happy.

I do not object, Sir, to your interpretation of theſe grateful acknowledgments into a ſpecies of *adoption* of the Revolution Society by the National Aſſembly.—The *adopters* and the *adopted* will reflect mutual and laſting credit on each other; and however you may jeer, and make a mock of the adoption, moſt ſober-minded men, I truſt, will agree with me, that the Revolution Society could not in a more becoming, nor probably in a more acceptable manner "*return the favour*" of adoption, than "*by extending the principles of the National Aſſembly.*"—In general the principles well merit extenſion, as probably your eſſay will, as I proceed in my ſtrictures on it, furniſh me with ſufficient occaſion to prove; for as I read, I comment.

One of their principles is particularly worthy of imitation in Britain, viz. the excluſion of the miniſters of, and dependents on the crown, from all ſhare of the legiſlative function in the National Aſſembly. It could not eſcape the penetration of the French political reformers, that the liberty of that country muſt be merely nominal, where the legiſlative and the executive powers of government are veſted in the hands of the ſame individuals; and that ſuch an union of theſe two powers conſtitutes deſpotiſm. They have experimental proof before their eyes,

that

that the conſtitution of Britain, though nominally free, may be ſubverted by the admiſſion of miniſters and their underlings into the Houſe of Commons. By the good things of the crown, penſions, places, lucrative offices, and ſinecures, with a long ſeries of ſimilar *etceteras*, in the diſpoſal of the crown, but beſtowed at the expence of the people, they can always ſecure a majority for the vile purpoſe of legiſlating for their own private emolument and aggrandiſement, inſtead of the national welfare.—I was ſo conſcious Sir, that the ſeparation of the two powers was indiſpenſibly neceſſary to the eſtabliſhment of national liberty, that four months before the French revolution took place, I propoſed the excluſion of miniſters from the Houſe of Commons, as the firſt article of a plan of reform, in my "Political Reformation on a large Scale," &c. where you may ſee the wiſdom, propriety, and neceſſity of the meaſure diſcuſſed at large, and the meaſure itſelf proved to be not only founded on thoſe natural equal rights of man which you ſo much deſpiſe, but alſo perfectly conformable to the principles of our political conſtitution, as inherited from and practiſed by our Saxon anceſtors.

It is with the ſame juſt jealouſy of a relapſe into monarchic deſpotiſm, that the French patriots have denied to the crown a negative in matters of legiſlation, and deprived it of the dangerous prerogative of declaring war, and conſequently, of ſhedding the blood, and ſquandering the treaſure of the people.

as the royal will, pleaſure, and caprice ſhall dictate. —You, Sir, who ſeem to have loſt ſight of common good manners in your invectives againſt theſe patriots, in the ebullition of your *charity*, term them, page 166, "*Atheiſtical Fathers.*" I do not heſitate to denominate them heroes in virtue and religion; for it is a ſtrange kind of Atheiſm which impels men to imitate the Deity in his amiable moral attributes, by thus providing for the ſecurity, liberty, and happineſs of the human race. Moreover, theſe Atheiſts reſemble the God of peace, in renouncing offenſive war. They can be Atheiſts then in your imagination only, (and a very extraordinary imagination it is!) or, for argument's ſake, merely in word, for in theſe their works they acknowledge and worſhip God, and thereby evince themſelves equal, perhaps ſuperior, to many Chriſtians of civil eſtabliſhments in religion.—But if you will ſtill perſiſt in ſtigmatiſing them as "*Atheiſtical Fathers,*" I beſeech you to unite with me in grateful acknowledgments to the one God and Father of all, for his goodneſs and wiſdom in directing his train of natural events, or ſecond cauſes, ſo as to make Atheiſm and Infidelity the inſtruments of ſubverting ſuperſtition and tyranny.

In page 5 you cenſure the Revolution Society for "*giving, by a congratulatory addreſs, an authori-*
"*tative ſanction to the proceedings of the National*
"*Aſſembly.*"—Not only ſocieties of men, Sir, but private individuals, can claim, and ought to exert their

their right, to tranſmit their approbation, accompanied with congratulation, of every meaſure which tends to liberate a country, long enthralled, to a cruel oppreſſive *triad* of monarchic, ariſtocratic, and hierarchic deſpotiſm. If you chuſe to diſtinguiſh this proceeding of the ſociety with the appellation of "*an authoritative ſanction*," I believe they will not be diſpoſed to cavil with you about the exact propriety of it.

In the ſame page the ſuſpicious privy counſellor "*thinks it very probable, that, for ſome purpoſe, new* "*members may have entered among them*," the Revolution Society; and, with the addition of a ſneer, "*that ſome truly Chriſtian politicians, who love to* "*diſpenſe benefits, but are careful to conceal the hand* "*which diſtributes the dole, may have made them the* "*inſtruments of their pious deſigns.*"—As you do not ſpecify the "*ſome purpoſe*" of your ſuppoſed "*new members*" of the ſociety, it amounts to no purpoſe at all; and this part of the ſentence ſeems to be framed merely to gratify your wonderful propenſity to indulge a ſelf-tormenting ſpirit of needleſs ſurmiſe.

Now, my wiſe *Heautontimoroumenos!* let me advert to your "*ſome truly Chriſtian politicians!* It is very natural for a ſubtle man of the world to contemn "*truly Chriſtian politicians.*" Being accuſtomed when ranking among oppoſitioniſts and ex-miniſters, to uſe his utmoſt efforts to talk or write himſelf into power, for the *laudable* pur-

poſes of obtaining an ample Crown-ſalary as a miniſter, and of retiring from adminiſtration on a penſion, the extorted alms of the public, it cannot be expected his narrow contracted ſoul, whoſe views centre ſolely in dear ſelf, can form adequate elevated ideas of "great minds, like heaven, pleaſed with doing "good," and which can "*love to diſpenſe benefits*," without the proſpect of any other recompence than that which reſults from the ſelf-approving conſcience of "a good man ſatisfied from himſelf." Such a low groveling animal in human ſhape is ever forward to ſuſpect a ſecret eleemoſynary gratuity diſtributed to ſome "*truly Chriſtian politicians*," who delight, from a noble principle of diſintereſted beneficence, to expend a part of their property in paper and print, for the worthy purpoſe of diſſeminating among their fellow creatures the knowledge of thoſe axioms in politics, that all government is the gift of the people, and the end of government, whether legiſlative, judicial, or executive, their protection, liberty, and happineſs. Whatever may be your future public conduct in our preſent autumn of life, for we cannot inſure the coming winter of it, I hope ever to practically adhere to that benevolent political maxim, *Salus populi ſuprema lex.* If theſe Chriſtian patriots "*have*," by their writings "*made them*," the Revolution Society, "*the inſtruments of their pious deſigns*," neither the principals nor the agents need be aſhamed of their co-operation in eſtabliſhing the future freedom,

peace,

peace, and proſperity of the whole human race. But here you again ſneakingly obtrude your unappropriate word *ſome*; "*ſome truly Chriſtian politicians!*" not daring, in an open manly manner, to name individuals, or their works. You act with the uſual timid caution of a man trammelled in court manœuvres, ſolicitous to keep from the eye of the public any tract which may enlighten their minds on the ſubject of the natural equal rights of men reſpecting legiſlative concerns, or their juſt claim, both by nature and the Engliſh conſtitution, to the enjoyment of an Houſe of Commons, annually elected, on the comprehenſive, liberal, benevolent principles of univerſal ſuffrage and eligibility, with the excluſion only of the civil and judicial dependants on the crown.

I doubt not but the ſame principle of careful prudence will account for your ſilence reſpecting the new Society of the Friends of Parliamentary Reform. It is a ſubject which you of all men ſeem to be the laſt to bring before the public.

I ſhall cloſe my ſtrictures on this paſſage of your work with a frank acknowledgment, that in my "Political Reformation," before referred to, it was my ſole ſtudy and delight to evince myſelf a "*truly Chriſtian politician*," and to form my plan of an Houſe of Commons on the natural and Chriſtian principles of univerſal equity, benevolence, and liberty. Herein I judged it incumbent on me to awaken the people at large, if poſſible,

to

to a ſenſe of their true political intereſts, and to a reſolute, though peaceable demand, to be inveſted with the enjoyment of their unalienable natural and conſtitutional rights. On this occaſion I am not "*careful to conceal the hand which diſtributes the dole,*" becauſe I never received any pecuniary or other compenſation for this my "labour of love," ſave what aroſe from the ſale of the work, which has hitherto left me on the *minus* ſide of the debtor and creditor account between the public and me.

The Apoſtle Paul ſays, (2 Cor. xii. 7.) "Leſt I "ſhould be exalted above meaſure, through the "abundance of the revelations, there was given to "me a thorn in the fleſh, the meſſenger of Satan, "to buffet me."—By this latter expreſſion is not meant an imp of that *non-entity*, the devil; but this "thorn in the fleſh," ſome bodily diſeaſe, was the Satan; that is, the adverſary ſent to keep down his pride and ſelf-conceit. In like manner, leſt you ſhould be exalted above meaſure, through the number of your *Reflections*, your "*truly Chriſtian poli-*"*ticians*," and "*dreaded men of letters*," to whoſe writings, conjointly with "the auſpicions example "of the French Revolutioniſts," this country will, under God, be indebted for a future radical reform of its corrupted conſtitution, on the broad baſis of equal political liberty, will prove ſo many Satans, or adverſaries; and their plaguy Anſwers ſo many thorns in your ſide, to bring down thoſe lofty ideas of ſelf-importance, which probably will not be lowered

lowered by the adulatory compliments of a ſervile herd of French ariſtocrats and hierarchs, and ſimilar abettors of deſpotiſm.

In pages 5 and 6 you ſay, "*having no general apoſtolical miſſion,*" not even from St. Ignatius Loyola's ſociety of Jeſus; "*being a citizen of a particular ſtate,*" and not a citizen of the world, "*I ſhould think it at leaſt improper and irregular for me to open a formal public correſpondence with the actual government of a foreign nation, without the expreſs authority of the government under which I live.*" In this point alſo I cannot but diſſent from you. I cannot be eaſily led to think ſuch "*expreſs authority*" neceſſary to juſtify the Revolution Society, or a private individual, were he ſo diſpoſed, to "*open*" ſuch "*correſpondence with*" ſuch "*government,*" either for the purpoſe of felicitating them on the national emancipation from deſpotiſm, or with the ſtill more generous view of ſuggeſting improvements of their riſing free conſtitution. You, Sir, as one *e ſecretis conſiliis regis Britanniæ*, and a member of the Houſe of Commons, enjoy excluſive privileges; do not, therefore, meanly envy, or illiberally ſeek to moleſt private ſocieties or individuals in the exerciſe of this right of correſpondence, which their rank in the creation, as human beings, gives them, in common with the reſt of their ſpecies. "*The mere authority of individuals,*" of which you ſlightingly ſpeak (page 7), when founded in truth and juſtice, often does and ought always to poſſeſs more weight

and influence, than ſtate authority, when deſtitute of theſe cardinal virtues for its ſupporters.

The Socratic precept, "KNOW THYSELF," is ſeldom practiſed, becauſe, Right Honourable Sir! ſelf-knowledge is the moſt difficult of all knowledge. "The heart of man," ſays an inſpired apoſtle, "is deceitful above all things."—It is poſſible therefore you may err in ſtiling yourſelf, a plain man, "*Me who am but a plain man.*"—I rather regard you more as an Œdipus than a Davus; but let that paſs. "*I love a manly, moral, regulated liberty, as well "as any gentleman of that* (the Revolution) *Society.*" I will not enter upon an invidious compariſon of your merits with thoſe of the Society in this inſtance; but I muſt beſeech you in your next edition *bis decies repetita placebit*, to demonſtrate to me your ſimplicity, that you are "*a plain man*," by unequivocally ſpecifying your ideas of the nature and extent of ſuch liberty.—"*Perhaps I have given as "good proofs of my attachment to that cauſe, in the "whole courſe of my public conduct.*" This my anſwer would run out into an immeaſurable length, were the whole of your "*public conduct*," or even of your public Reflections, to paſs the ordeal trial of my review. But, as I ſcorn indiſcriminate diſpraiſe, much more to cenſure where praiſe is due, I rejoice to own without a *ſneer*, and without a *ſarcaſm*, the obligations of the community to you, Sir, for your parliamentary attempt to reduce the expences of the civil liſt in the time of Lord North's adminiſtration;

niſtration; as alſo for your indefatigable diligence in obtaining that memorable reſolution of the Houſe of Commons, which decreed, that "the influence "of the Crown had increaſed, was increaſing, and "ought to be diminiſhed;"—a reſolution, ſtrange! yet not more ſtrange than true, never followed with any efficacious parliamentary meaſure to diminiſh that influence. I think too, you had the ſole excluſive merit of the motion, which led to this reſolution; and though your patriotic conduct in theſe two inſtances did not appear till towards the expiration of the then-exiſting parliament, in the year 1780, when it might be ſuppoſed you would wiſh to return to your conſtituents for their re-election with ſome diſtinguiſhing repreſentative *eclat*; yet I ſhould be aſhamed not to give you credit for the intrinſic moral rectitude of the motive, which actuated your public conduct. But, my dear Sir! (pardon the familiar appellation, for you are dear to me as a fellow creature,) a moment's reflexion, a mere iota of that profound political ſagacity which you certainly poſſeſs, muſt have convinced you, that it is mere labour in vain to attempt an amendment of the executive branch of government, without firſt accompliſhing a radical reform of our legiſlative Houſe of Commons on the durable, comprehenſive, and philanthropic principles of my plan, which is now before the public.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER III.

Logical defence of an agreement between politics and the pulpit.---Political liberty an essential branch of Christian morality, and consequently a fit subject of pulpit instruction.---The apostle Paul's intrepid defence of his Roman citizenship considered with suitable inferences.---The governments of Europe founded on immorality.---The necessity of a reform of the House of Commons, on moral principles, and those principles specified.---Dr. Price defended from the censure of Mr. Burke.---Gallio's refusal to interfere in religious matters recommended to the imitation of civil magistrates.---Mr. Burke a botanist, but mistakes the garden of nature for an hortus siccus.

I Now follow you to page 14, where you advance, "*politics and the pulpit are terms that have little agreement.*"—I am rejoiced at the opportunity you give me to controvert this position; I was never over fond of the logic of the schools, having too much levity to relish their cant jargon of "*Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferio, Baralipton.*" However, I have no objection to enter the lists with you, in our new pulpito-political, or politico-pulpit school.

But before we begin our war of words, I must stipulate, that, like the famed pugilists Humphries and Mendoza, we shake hands before we engage, in token that we bear no malice in our hearts; or let us, at the close of the argument, imitate the laudable example of barristers, who forget their animosity

moſity in court, *pendente lite*, and in ſocial good humour crack a bottle of port together at the tavern. Eccleſiaſtics, in conformity to the luxury of the laity, have exchanged their primitive pipe and October, for the more modern juice of the grape. —It will be neceſſary too to chuſe a moderator a-piece. Mine ſhould have been Dr. Price. On your part, you may appoint that truly reſpectable character in his profeſſion and private life, your friend and publiſher, Mr. Dodſley. I who, of courſe, am opponent or reſpondent, ſuppoſe you to come forward with this categorical ſyllogiſm: Politics and morals are terms which have little agreement, but morals and the pulpit are terms which have much agreement; *ergo*, politics and the pulpit have little agreement. Or you may put it hypothetically, thus: If politics and morals be terms which have little agreement, and morals and the pulpit be terms which have much agreement, then politics and the pulpit are terms which have little agreement; but politics and morals, &c. *ergo*, politics and the pulpit, &c. *nego minorem*. That is, I deny that politics and morals are terms which have little agreement. If politics ought to be founded in a ſtrict regard to morals, then it is not true that politics and morals are terms which have little agreement; but politics ought, &c. *ergo*, it is not true, &c. I do not apprehend that you will deny that politics ought to be founded in a ſtrict regard to morals, and therefore ſhall cloſe the

debate

debate with the following hypothetical ſyllogiſm: If it be not true that politics and morals are terms which have little agreement, and morals and the pulpit be terms which have much agreement, then it is not true that politics and the pulpit are terms which have little agreement; but it is not true that politics and morals, &c. *ergo*, it is not true that politics and the pulpit, &c.—I think it very probable that both the moderators would decide in my favour.

Now, Sir, political liberty I regard as a moſt eſſential branch of Chriſtian morality, and conſequently as a fit ſubject of pulpit inſtruction at all ſeaſons, but particularly ſo on ſuch a public occaſion as called forth the eminent ſermonizing abilities of that Chriſtian patriot, Dr. Price. That only gentleman and ſcholar among all the apoſtles, Paul, was very tenacious of his rights and franchiſes as a citizen of Rome. When the magiſtrates of Philippi, the metropolis of Macedonia, and a municipal city of Rome, had violated theſe rights in the perſon of himſelf and his fellow-labourer in the Goſpel, Silas, he did not indeed ſeek to puniſh theſe magiſtrates by citing them before the Roman governor of the province to anſwer for the crime of *leze nation*, becauſe they through ignorance offended, not knowing that theſe apoſtles were Roman citizens. However, he did not think that their ignorance was a plea ſufficient to juſtify him in a tame acquieſcence in the inſult, or in a neglect to vindi-

cate

cate the privileges of the citizens of Rome. On the contrary, he inſiſted upon a proper ſubmiſſion and acknowledgment from the magiſtrates for their illegal ill uſage. Acts, xvi. 37, 38, 39. "They have "beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, "and have caſt us into priſon; and now do "they thruſt us out privily? Nay, verily, but let "them come themſelves, and fetch us out. And "the ſerjeants told theſe words unto the magiſtrates, "and they feared when they heard that they were "Romans; and they came and *beſought* them, and "*brought* them out, and *deſired* them to depart out of "the city."—Paul's commiſſion, indeed, was confined to a general predication of the goſpel, which found him ſufficient employment. It did not extend to any change or reform of government; but the patriotic conduct of this intrepid and zealous vindicator of Roman privileges proves, to a demonſtration, that if he had been born a Briton, in theſe more enlightened times of knowledge reſpecting political liberty, when the Chriſtian religion, though in a more or leſs corrupt ſtate, is become the eſtabliſhed religion of moſt of the countries of Europe, he would have been forward to declare from the pulpit and the preſs, on the principle of the practice of that ſound morality, which the religion of Chriſt enjoins, that the people are not made for kings as their *proprietors*, but kings for the people as their *protectors*. Nor would he in this caſe have been ſatisfied with preaching and publiſhing on the duty of forming, or reforming every ſyſtem

of

of government on thoſe perfect moral principles, the natural equal rights of men, but would have been the firſt to ſummon the people, with the philanthropic voice of an univerſal Chriſtian patriot, to unite in a demand to be inveſted with the poſſeſſion of theſe rights, rights very conſiſtent with an inequality of property. Nay, the enjoyment of theſe rights tends as much to ſecure the ample poſeſſions of the rich from the invaſion of the poor, as to defend the poor from the oppreſſion of the rich. It is much to be lamented, that the governments of Europe, (for I advert not to the very abject deſpotiſm of Aſia and Africa) are in their preſent degenerate ſtate, founded in a weak, wretched, wicked ſyſtem of policy; I may add, in groſs immorality; for to exemplify in Britain only, few inſtances of more groſs immorality can be produced than this, that in conſequence of the ſhare of the legiſlative function, which the miniſters of the crown and their mercenary dependants poſſeſs in the Houſe of Commons, the lives, liberties, and properties of ſix or ſeven millions of people are ſubject to their controul and diſpoſal. The people can never be free and happy, till they be excluded from this legiſlative aſſembly. I do not regard this excluſion as the only effectual meaſure to deſtroy miniſterial influence in the Houſe of Commons; and without ſuch deſtruction in all its ſhapes and gradations, no radical permanent reform, on moral principles, ſo evidently neceſſary, can be accompliſhed; but I eſteem it a kind of baſis, or, as it were, the corner-

ſtone,

ſtone, of the glorious ſuperſtructure, an honeſt independent Houſe of Commons. This neceſſary excluſion of the dependants on the crown, as members of the Houſe, and as voters at parliamentary elections, united with the co-operative aid of thoſe natural rights, equal and univerſal ſuffrage and eligibility, of annual open elections, of the payment of the repreſentative by the conſtituent body, and of the ſuppreſſion of candidateſhip and canvaſs, affords us the pleaſing proſpect of inſuring national liberty and happineſs, under the divine bleſſing, to the end of time, or at leaſt till God permit Chriſt to enter on his promiſed perſonal kingdom in Judea, in perfect love, peace and righteouſneſs, over the whole earth.

You proceed, "*no ſound ought to be heard in the church, but the healing voice of Chriſtian charity.*" Granted, with this addition, and in political matters that important ſpecies of "*Chriſtian charity*," which conſiſts in legiſlating for the benefit of the many, inſtead of ſacrificing the advancement of national ſecurity and intereſt to the enrichment and aggrandiſement of the few.

"*The cauſe of civil liberty and civil government gains* "*as little as that of religion, by this confuſion of duties*," viz. of politics and the pulpit. Having proved, that civil government ought to be founded on the ſtricteſt regard to morals, and the enforcement of moral duties being the peculiar province of the pulpit, I infer that the preacher of the goſpel, who endeavours to occaſionally impreſs, and particularly

on

on public occaſions, on the minds of his congregation, a ſenſe of their indiſpenſible obligations to guard their natural and conſtitutional rights and liberties with a jealous eye, is ſo far from incuring by ſuch conduct a "*confuſion of duties*," that he eſtabliſhes an union of duties. Moreover by explaining the nature of political liberty, and inſiſting on the true ſole end of government, the welfare of the community, he ſo far fulfils his obligations to his fellow-creatures as a Chriſtian philanthropiſt. In times when the ſyſtem of parliamentary corruption is puſhed to its acme of refinement and perfection; when, as at Rome, in the days of Salluſt, that conciſe, nervous hiſtorian, found too much cauſe to exclaim "*omnia ſunt venalia*," the repreſentation of boroughs is impudently advertiſed for ſale in the public papers; when the hydra of miniſteriai and ariſtocratic influence in the Houſe of Commons, which like that of heathen mythology, undergoes a momentary and ſeptennial expiration, merely for the purpoſe of a ſeptennial reviviſcence, threatens by an accumulation of taxes, and a load of debt, to ſwallow up all which is dear and valuable to us; when ſuch is the true lamentable ſtate of our degenerate political conſtitution, it becomes the duty of every preacher, whether within or without the pale of the church, to commence what you at page 13 contemptuouſly ſtile, a "*political theologian.*" In theſe unhappy national circumſtances, miniſters of the goſpel do not "*quit their proper character to aſſume what "does not belong to them*," but adhere to it, if

they

they preach from the pulpit, or publiſh from the preſs, the expediency, and indeed neceſſity, of uniting in a firm but peaceable manner, by national convention, for the expreſs purpoſe of accompliſhing a radical laſting parliamentary reform, on the natural moral and Chriſtian principles of univerſal equity, benevolence, and liberty. By thus acting, not with a "*confuſion of duties*," but with a conſiſtency of character, they would deſerve the thanks of their congregations and the public, for ſupplying, like Iolaus of old, that Hercules, the people at large, with fire-brands to ſtaunch the blood iſſuing from the decapitated wounds of the ſeven-headed monſter. "*The cauſe of civil liberty*," and juſt "*civil government*," would "*gain*," not "*little*," but much, by this not "*confuſion*" but union "*of duties*" in "*politico theologians*," and "*theologico politicians.*" Much alſo, and not "*little*," would "*that of religion*" gain thereby; for he who would love God, muſt "love his brother alſo." And how can a pulpit politician evince his love of his brethren or fellow creatures more ſubſtantially than by providing for the morals of the people in a reform of government on moral principles.

In page 15 I find theſe expreſſions, "*the old ſtaple of the national church.*" Theſe ſavour ſtrongly of popery. They ſmell rank of the Engliſh college of Jeſuits at St. Omer's; I therefore paſs them by without farther comment.

You next glance a cenſure at Dr. Price:—"*Dr.*

"*Price adviſes the noble ſeekers to ſet up each of them a* "*ſeparate meeting-houſe upon his own particular prin-* "*ciples.*"—Now, Sir, Dr. Price in this advice, acted on the une quivocal principles, and in the genuine ſpirit of a Chriſtian philanthropiſt. This good man, who little reſembled you, except in the circumſtance of having paſſed before his death his "*grand climacteric,*" a circumſtance which in your own caſe you ſeem to think, (at page 313,) it concerns the public to know, fully underſtood the nature and extent of that ſpecies of ſocial liberty, which is ſtiled religious. He was convinced, that religion is a private concern between every man's conſcience and his God, and in which no third party, either as one man, a ſet of men, or even the civil magiſtrate, has a right to interfere. In the laſt inſtance, the good and wiſe conduct of Gallio in ſcripture, the Roman proconſul of Achaia, is a caſe in point; and, as ſuch, well deſerving the imitation of thoſe who are entruſted with the legiſlative or executive government of every country. I refer you to Acts xviii. 12, 15. This advice therefore of Dr. Price, in perfect uniſon with his reverence for the ſacred rights of conſcience in religious concerns, will meet, I truſt, the cordial approbation, not only of the various denominations of diſſenters, but of all churchmen who are not bigots and fanatics, or the inanimate puppets of mere ſtate-machinery. You indeed, in the *exuberance* of your *charity*, more than inſinuate "*that this reverend divine,*" is "*perfectly indifferent concerning the doctrine which*

which may be taught in the new churches." This is a very unfair inference from the Doctor's vindication of the natural right of men, "*to set up a separate* "*worship of themselves,*" if they "*dislike*" the "*mode of* "*worship prescribed by public authority.*"—The Doctor, I doubt not, wished that the "*new churches*" might be distinguished by "*a rational and manly worship*;" no indifference therefore in this respect is implied in his advice; but this fair deduction may be made from it, that "*the noble seekers,*" should not be molested, if, instead of worshipping the one God and Father of all, in spirit and in truth, their "*pious fancies,*" should lead them to adopt a mode or species of worship not quite so consistent with the simple uncorrupt dictates of natural and revealed religion.

"*His zeal,*" (the zeal of Dr. Price,) you add, "*is* "*not for the diffusion of truth, but for the spreading of* "*contradiction.*" I am surprized, that you, in page 15, should incur the same error, which you are forward to impute to others in page 14, viz. a propensity to "*pronounce with so much confidence on affairs,*" in which they are "*inexperienced.*" You, Sir, "*pronounce with confidence*" on the motive of the Doctor's zeal, a matter of which you must necessarily be completely ignorant. Here you lay yourself open to the retort courteous; and "*quit*" your "*proper character,*" as a man of the world, to expose your ignorance in religious concerns, in which you "*are so fond of meddling.*" You know not, that "*the diffusion of truth,*" is best promoted by the "*spreading of contra-*

diction." To indulge every man in the exerciſe of his right of conſcience, the "*propagation of his own religious opinions,*" is the readieſt, ſureſt way, amidſt the variety of opinions, to detect error, and in the final event, to aſcertain and eſtabliſh truth.

The following fine rhetorical flouriſh, which powerfully excites my riſible faculties, ſtamps you a botaniſt of the Linnæan ſchool. "*This great company of great preachers,*" who are to occupy the new pulpits, "*would certainly be a valuable addition of nondeſcripts to the ample collection of known claſſes, genera, and ſpecies which at preſent beautify the hortus-ſiccus of diſſent.*" This may appear in the eyes of the admirers of your ſtyle, a *mighty pretty* metaphor; but I am much miſtaken, if an under-graduate of the univerſity, or rather a claſſical ſchool-boy, would not be aſhamed to introduce it into his theme. It is (to humour you in your affectation of the *ſublime and beautiful*) a forced unnatural exotic, and merits the epithets, "*puerile and pedantic,*" which, in page 313, you ſo liberally affix to that "*ſyſtem which the French call a conſtitution.*" What you ſcornfully term "*the hortus-ſiccus of diſſent,*" is the garden of nature. It does not indeed yield the rich luſcious fruits of the foreign frame, the *hot-bed*, of the eſtabliſhment, but it abounds with the ſpontaneous product of uſeful plants, with trees of knowledge human and divine, very different from that Adamic tree of good and evil, that "forbidden fruit," whoſe taſte, in the lan-

guage

guage of that arch-adverſary of deſpotiſm, the immortal Milton,

"Brought death into the world, and all our woe."

In particular, in this "*hortus-ficcus*," deſpiſed by the king's privy counſellor, as in its natural ſoil thoſe fair twin-ſcyons of ever-greens, political and religious liberty, ſhooting from their parent-ſtock, the tree of ſocial liberty, flouriſh and ſend forth vigorous and ſpreading branches, puſhing their aſpiring ſummit to the ſkies. How diſſimilar and ſuperior are theſe to your *ſtinted, lopped, polled* tree of "*regulated* "*liberty*," planted in the garden of the eſtabliſhment, where nature's vigorous vegetation is checked by the clipping ſheers of art. Pruned, trimmed, and cut into a variety of groteſque ſhapes, according to the pleaſure of your excentric perverted imagination, it reſembles the *formal* yews, fantaſtically diſtorted from their natural growth, in the antiquated ſtyle of *horticulture*. I do not uſe the common term *gardening*, becauſe I would comply with your taſte for pompous diction. In this "*hortus-ficcus*" may no "*infelix lolium et ſteriles dominentur avenæ*," and may it never admit that noxious barren weed, plant, or tree, which common gardeners emphatically call the *bad neighbour*; becauſe within the influence of its ſhade, no ſalutiferous plant can thrive. This, through ignorance of its true botanical name, I deſcribe under the novel claſs of the *Burkicum genus per ſe*.

I ſhall now ſtrip you of your tropes and figures, diveſt you of your gaudy peacock plumage of ſtile,

and expoſe you naked to the public eye, a ſwaggering, ſtrutting, chattering ———; the fable may ſupply the reſt.

In the plain Engliſh garb of language, unembelliſhed with a gorgeous dreſs of diction, this laboured ſentence about "*the hortus ſiccus*," amounts to no more than the acknowledgment of a truiſm, which "nobody can deny," and may be thus conciſely and intelligibly expreſſed. "*This great company of great preachers*," in the new churches, if it be admitted that each preacher is the founder of a new ſect, "*will add greatly to the number of the preſent known ſects of diſſenters.*" If you thought it neceſſary to inform the good people of Britain of a circumſtance which they could not but know without your information, why, in the name of common ſenſe, could you not inform them in few plain words, without the needleſs periphraſis of a diſguſting bombaſt metaphor, applied to the whole reſpectable body of diſſenters? You ſeem to wiſh and to ſtudy to affront them, and eſpecially thoſe of their number, whom you are pleaſed to contemptuouſly term "*the noble ſeekers*:" But the contempt rebounds with redoubled force on yourſelf. They cannot but deſpiſe your indulgence of a tinſel tawdry meretricious eloquence at their expence; they cannot but deride your feeble attempt to conceal, under *a ſpecious richneſs* of *manner*, your *real poverty* of *matter*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Diſcuſſion of the ſubject of elective and hereditary crowns.—Radical reform of the Houſe of Commons conſiſtent with, and preſervative of, an hereditary crown.—Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that the King on the throne owes his hereditary crown to the election of the people, in the perſons of their repreſentatives.—The privy-counſellor ſmells a plot in embrio, and is, in conſequence, inveſted, at the ſeaſon of maturity, with the office of Accoucheur.

PAGE 16, your not very harmleſs rhodomontading farrago about "*Meſſ-Johns in robes and "coronets,—levelling principles,—polemic divines,—"regiments of dragoons, and corps of infantry and "artillery,*" is not very well calculated to conciliate the affections of the Proteſtant Non-conformiſts, and conſequently "*not* very *conducive to the national "tranquillity.*"

I come now to the examination of the very intereſting part of your Reflections on Dr. Price's poſition, "*That his majeſty is almoſt the* ONLY *law-"ful king in the world, becauſe the* ONLY *one, who owes "his crown to the choice of his* PEOPLE." I was happy in a ſlight acquaintance with Dr. Price, and my eſteem for his memory is not in the leaſt diminiſhed by any little accidental difference in our religious opinions, or in our ideas reſpecting leſs the nature than the extent of political liberty. I could wiſh this venerable Chriſtian patriot, your

"*ſpiritual*

"*ſpiritual doctor of politics,*" page 17, whom, with a petulance peculiar to yourſelf, you nickname "*Archpontiff of the* RIGHTS OF MEN," had to the word "*crown*" added the epithet *hereditary*; but though it be not expreſſed, I ſhall take it for granted it is implied. I ſhall not examine whether the King of Britain be the only one "*who owes his*" hereditary "*crown to the choice of his people,*" but do not heſitate to proclaim thoſe kings "*uſurpers,*" whoſe pretended title to their crowns originates not in the gift of the people, expreſsly beſtowed, or tacitly implied; and who by force or fraud obtain deſpotic power. It matters not whether crowns be annually, for a term of years, or *durante vitâ* elective, or *electively hereditary*; I mean only to aſſert and prove that crowns muſt be elective in ſome one of theſe modes by the people, perſonally or repreſentatively, to conſtitute the wearers of them "*lawful* "*kings*;" ſo well founded in truth is "*the principle*" you oppoſe in page 23, "*that a king of popular choice* "*is the only legal king.*" Yet, with ſingular inconſiſtency, you grant, in page 19, "*there is ground* "*enough for the opinion, that all the kingdoms of Europe were, at a remote period, elective.*" In truth, your ideas of the firſt principles of government are, in my judgment, very imperfect, indiſtinct, and erroneous: and well they may be ſo, really or affectedly ignorant as you are of the natural equal rights of men, the baſis of all government, though the butt of your ſcorn and ridicule. Mankind, conſcious

that

that in a ſtate of ſavage nature the weakeſt becomes a prey to the ſtrongeſt, embody themſelves in civil ſociety for the preſervation of theſe rights, namely, their lives, liberties, and properties. I ſhall not enter into a minute, tedious diſquiſition about the firſt acquiſition of ſeparate excluſive property, whether by prior occupancy of the ſoil, or by a ſocial contract, or by amicable partition. It is ſufficient for my purpoſe to remark, that all men are intereſted in the enjoyment of theſe natural equal rights, and that from theſe rights are deducible their claim to the choice of that form of government which is beſt adapted to protect them, and to reform it when, through inadvertence, length of time, or the craft of deſigning men, or from any other cauſe, they find ſuch errors or abuſes crept into it as bear hard on theſe natural rights, and threaten the impairment or loſs of them. Hence too ariſes the right of every man to a voice in the choice of thoſe who are to be entruſted with the exerciſe of thoſe three neceſſary and important functions of government, the legiſlative, the judicial, and executive powers, which the ſecurity and welfare of the community require ſhould be veſted in the hands of different individuals. When they are blended in the ſame man, or ſet of men, government becomes deſpotic, liberty ends, and ſlavery begins. But, as the preſent point in diſpute between us reſpects only the executive power, I ſhall confine myſelf to it. However, before I proceed, I cannot forbear remarking,

marking, it ſurely would have been more adviſable to have reſtrained your oratory within the walls of a certain chapel, or to have diſplayed it as a proſecutor in the long-protracted trial of an Indian Governor, than to ſurprize the public with an unprovoked printed queſtion about elective and hereditary crowns, in a publication which ſavours more of diffuſive, turgid, declamatory nonſenſe, than of a nervous, thundering Philippic, armed with the irreſiſtible force of ſound argument. But, alas! more "*fond of meddling*," and diſpoſed to "*pronounce with* "*confidence*," than thoſe you, at (page 14) accuſe of theſe faults, you have brought a point into diſpute, which otherwiſe might have lain dormant for ever; and, in fact, may have virtually, though unintentionally, declared that from the day of the publication of your Reflections, "there ſhall be no peace in "Iſrael." I hope, however, to counteract their evil tendency and impreſſion in this inſtance, by a frank delivery of my ſentiments, that the very neceſſary complete reform of that legiſlative body, the Houſe of Commons, is not only very compatible with an "*hereditary crown*," but tends to inſure the preſervation of it. I verily believe, that in a coincidence with theſe ſentiments I ſhall find not a ſingle diſſenting voice among the members of the reſpectable ſocieties, which you have ſo completely honoured with your animadverſions, more pert than pertinent.

I now

I now preſume to oppoſe your political doctrine, that "*the king of Great Britain moſt certainly does* "*not owe his high*" hereditary "*office to any form of* "*popular election.*" In defence of this doctrine you urge, page 32, that "*the princes who ſucceeded accord-* "*ing to the act of Parliament, which ſettled the crown* "*on the electreſs Sophia, and on her deſcendants, being* "*Proteſtants, came in by a title of inheritance.*" You ſhould have ſaid *elective* "*inheritance.*" What was "*the act of Parliament, which*" ſo "*ſettled the* "*crown,*" but the reſult of the *choice* of the two Houſes of Parliament? and as the members of the then Houſe of Commons were, as now, *elected* by the people, at leaſt by thoſe among them, who, in the preſent very inadequate and defective ſtate of the repreſentation, have a voice in the *choice* of repreſentatives, it may fairly be ſaid, without the leaſt catachreſis, that "*the princes of the Houſe of* "*Brunſwick came to the inheritance of the crown by* "*election,*" or "*by a title of*" elective "*inheritance.*" What was this but a "*form of popular election?*" On the ſame principle of popular election, not perſonally, but repreſentatively made, was the Revolution in the perſon of King William conducted, and conſequently your aſſertion (page 23) that "*the ma-* "*jority in Parliament accepting King William was not* "*properly a choice,*" falls to the ground. After all, I cannot think that either the crown or the people, whoſe true intereſts are indiſſolubly connected, however inſidious courtiers may wiſh to ſeparate them, owe you

you any obligations for the officious introduction of the ſubject of elective and hereditary crowns. But it ſeems you muſt, at all events, be indulged in your ſelf-ſought *battle*, *prattle* and *rattle* with, and about the Revolution Society. At page 19 and 20 you aſſert, that "*the king of Great Britain holds his* "*crown in contempt of the choice of the Revolution* "*Society*," and "*his majeſty's heirs will come to the* "*crown with the ſame contempt of their choice.*" If it were poſſible for a king of Britain to be as rude as Mr. Burke, and to treat me, as an individual of the body politic, whoſe creative majeſty is ſuperior to delegated majeſty, with the ſame contemptuous, libellous language, which you, without the fear of *leze* nation before your eyes, uſe towards the Revolution Society, I would, inſtead of kiſſing his hand on the bended knee, ſalute the royal poſteriors with my foot. It ſeems the public muſt be teized or amuſed with your brilliant ſally of wit, page 19, "*they*," the ſaid ſociety "*would ſoon erect themſelves into an* "*electoral college, if things were ripe to give effect to* "*their claim.*" Oh, ho! the privy-counſellor ſmells a plot! Is it a gun-powder plot, a meal-tub plot, or a warming-pan plot? If the plot exiſt any how, or any where except in your Quixote imagination, it would have been kind in you, and proved you poſſeſſed a ſmall portion of public ſpirit, if you had not left the crown and the people ſo much in the dark about this ſame embrio ſtate of a plot. I could almoſt venture to engage that the Revolution

Society

Society, the father and mother of it, its hermaphrodite parent, concerned, as I apprehend, from your obſcure hints, both in its preſent generation, and its future parturition, will, when it is matured into a full-formed fœtus, and the minute of delivery approaches, call on you for your obſtetrical aid; exclaiming, in the extremity of the throes of travail, as the heathen ladies did of old on their Juno Lucina, "*Burke noſter! fer opem, ſerva me obſecro.*"

CHAP.

CHAPTER V.

Defence of the three fundamental rights of the people of England ſtated by Dr. Price.—Dr. Price's error reſpecting the acquiſition of theſe rights, corrected.—Refutation of Mr. Burke's poſition, that the Engliſh nation at the Revolution abdicated the right to elect their kings. Mr. Burke's aſſertion that the people of England look on the frame of their commonwealth, as it now ſtands, to be of ineſtimable value, contradicted by fact.—The probability of a miſapplication of the public money, proved by reference to a late trial in the court of King's Bench.—The Examiner's plan in his 'Political Reformation on a large Scale, &c.' calculated to make the frame of our commonwealth ſuch as it ONCE STOOD, AND OUGHT TO STAND.*—The Examiner ſuggeſts to the Diſſenters, that the repeal of the Teſt Act would be a neceſſary conſequence of a radical reform of the Houſe of Commons.*

IN page 20 you ſay, "*the political divine, Dr.* "*Price, proceeds dogmatically to aſſert, that by the* "*principles of the Revolution, the people of England* "*have acquired a right, 1ſt, to chooſe their own gover-* "*nors; 2dly, to caſhier them for miſconduct; 3dly, to* "*frame a government for themſelves.*"—Here I apprehend you entirely miſunderſtand the Doctor. He has before ſpoken of the king as "*one, who owes his*" hereditary "*crown to the choice of his people.*" Having finiſhed what he had to ſay on the ſubject of the executive power, he now proceeds to treat of the legiſlative. Therefore (I may be miſtaken, but) it appears to me, the Doctor meant to denote by the

the word "*governors*," not our "*kings*," according to your repreſentation, but our "*legiſlators*." I am ſtill more induced to think this was the Doctor's meaning, becauſe he adopts the plural number, "*governors*," not governor.—Paſſing by, therefore, moſt, if not all, of your reflections, made in conſequence of your probable miſconception of his meaning, I ſhall firſt make a general remark on this paſſage of the Doctor's Revolution Sermon, as cited by you; and then expatiate on theſe "*three* "*fundamental rights*," in their order. A recognition of theſe rights might be partly expreſſed, and partly implied, in the declaration of the Bill of Rights, paſſed into an act in the firſt year of the reign of William and Mary; but I cannot acknowledge, with the Doctor, that they were then "*acquired*." We came to the acquiſition of theſe rights in two ways, firſt by God's law of nature as men; and ſecondly, by the Saxon conſtitution of government, as Engliſhmen. The law of nature is prior and ſuperior to all political conſtitutions, and ſhould ſerve as a rule, model, and baſis for the formation, and, if neceſſary, the ſubſequent reformation, of them. Accordingly our wiſe and good Saxon anceſtors paid an eſpecial regard to the law of nature in all their mild political inſtitutions. The ſtricteſt attention to the equal rights of men is viſible in the whole frame of their free government, a government as friendly to thoſe rights, as the harſh, ariſtocratic, feudal ſyſtem of polity of the Normans is hoſtile.

The

The fair form of the former is disfigured, and almoſt eraſed by the corrupt predominant intermixture of the tyrannic principle of the latter. In ſhort, the two forms of government are at perpetual enmity with each other, and as irreconcilable in their nature as the allodial poſſeſſions of the one under Alfred the Great, with the ſlaviſh homage-tenures introduced by William the Invader, and the great Barons his followers.

"*To chuſe our own governors,*" or legiſlators, is indiſputably one of our fundamental rights, both natural and conſtitutional. The man who has not a voice in the choice of legiſlators is, to all intents and purpoſes, a ſlave. He is compelled to obey laws, made without his conſent, given either perſonally, or by his repreſentative: he, therefore, wears the diſtinguiſhing, humiliating badge of a bondman. Though he be not in this country, like the villani in former times, transferable with the ſoil, and other live ſtock on it, from owner to owner, yet he is forced to pay taxes, and heavy taxes, out of his property, levied by thoſe whom other men have ſet over him, and in whoſe election he is not ſuffered to partake. Six ſeventhſ of the men of age in Britain are excluded from, and many of them deprived, by an arbitrary disfranchiſing ſtatute of the eighth of Henry the ſixth, of their right of voting at parliamentary elections. Yet ſuch are the ſupineneſs, tameneſs, and I had almoſt ſaid ſtupidity of the collective body of the people, that they

cannot

cannot ſummon common ſenſe, common virtue, and common ſpirit, ſufficient to form a national convention, for the purpoſe of uniting in a formal demand, conducted with a judicious mixture of temper and firmneſs, of reſpect and ſpirit, to be reinſtated in this their natural and conſtitutional right.

The Doctor's ſecond fundamental right, "*to caſhier them*," our governors or legiſlators, "*for miſconduct*," is but a natural neceſſary conſequence of the firſt. If we find our repreſentatives in the Houſe of Commons, through the influence of the miniſters of the crown over them, or from any other cauſe, legiſlating for their own excluſive emolument, inſtead of the national welfare, or for the ſupport of ruinous wars, when a ſmall portion of underſtanding and of integrity might inſtruct them how to avoid offenſive war, eſpecially at a time when, as Earl Stanhope wiſely obſerved, at the opening of the preſent Parliament, "an opportunity preſents itſelf for forming an alli-"ance with France for that bleſſed purpoſe," a ſhadow of a doubt cannot ariſe, that the people poſſeſs a right "*to caſhier them for miſconduct.*"—The proper conſtitutional mode of caſhiering them, when ſuch neceſſity unhappily occurs, is, by petition to the crown for the diſſolution of Parliament. In this caſe, it is to be preſumed, the crown would not loſe ſight of its own *duty* and *intereſt*, by rejecting the petition.

The Doctor's third fundamental right of the people, "*to frame a government for ourſelves*," has been already noticed in my general remark on this your extract from his ſermon; I therefore here only add, that the "power" of government, is called, in Romans ch. xiii. ver. 2. "the ordinance of God;" becauſe God impowers men to frame a government moſt congenial to their own natural equal rights and wants, and beſt adapted to inſure the general ſafety, liberty, and happineſs. Government is alſo ſtiled, 1 Peter, ch. ii. ver. 13. "the ordinance of man;" becauſe men frame, or ought to frame, ſuch a government, in virtue of a conſtituting power derived from the God of nature. It is not neceſſary for us "*to frame a government for ourſelves*;" it is already framed; but an abſolute neceſſity exiſts for reforming our government, and in particular for reducing to its firſt pure unadulterated principles of nature, and of our Saxon conſtitution, that branch of the legiſlature, which more immediately reſpects the people at large, the Houſe of Commons. But this neceſſity is, I truſt, ſo plainly pointed out, and ſo ſtrongly enforced and theſe principles ſo fully explained, in my "*Political Reformation on a large Scale*," that I ſhall preſume to refer it to the public and you, Sir, if it be not a condeſcenſion "*below*" your "*tranſcendental dignity*" (page 10) to peruſe it. I do not heſitate to pronounce, that a reform of the Houſe of Commons, eſtabliſhed on the equitable, benevolent, comprehenſive principles therein

therein contained, would not leſs tend to the preſervation of the crown, made by the act of ſettlement, "*electively hereditary*" in the Houſe of Brunſwick Lunenburg, than to reſtore to the collective body of the people their juſt weight in the ſcale of government.

Having conſidered the "*three fundamental rights of Dr. Price,*" in a very different ſenſe from that in which you underſtand them, there will be leſs occaſion for me to be more particular in my ſtrictures on a few following pages of your pamphlet. But the flights of your *bizarre* imagination may be ſuch, as to make it neceſſary for me to arreſt you on the wing to the moon, and bring you down to this low ſublunary earth.

I cannot paſs unnoticed the extraordinary political tenet you broach in page 27, "*the Engliſh nation* "*did at that time,*" the time of the Revolution, "*moſt ſolemnly renounce and abdicate a right to elect* "*our kings, for themſelves and for all their poſterity for* "*ever.*" This is more befitting the grand Vizir of the Ottoman empire than a privy counſellor of the King of Britain. The Engliſh nation were neither ſo ſinful, nor ſo ſtupid, as to diſclaim and abdicate a right which their Creator had given them, and made inſeparable from their very nature; and with reſpect to their poſterity, they could not renounce it for them. "*The Engliſh,*" by their acquieſcence, perſevere in chuſing that the crown ſhall remain here-

ditary in "*the deſcendents of the electreſs Sophia.*" However this your ſtrange political dogma convinces me, that there is ſomething of an unhappy *unquietneſs* in your diſpoſition, a certain portion of a deſpotic ſpirit, which cannot but meet the diſapprobation of every ſerious ſober man, from the king on his throne to the cobler in his ſtall.

In page 36 you contend, that "*the people of Eng-*"*land, look on the frame of their common-wealth,* SUCH "AS IT STANDS, *to be of ineſtimable value.*" In the firſt place, by the law of our nature, adhered to in our free Saxon conſtitution of government, every man, arrived at leaſt at the year of maturity, can claim a right to a voice in the choice of legiſlators, the miniſters of the crown excepted, on this ſound principle, that the admiſſion of them to a ſhare in the election of Parliamentary repreſentatives would ſo influence the election as to endanger national liberty. This univerſal right, with this one neceſſary exception only, is a right not dependent on *property*, much leſs on any ſpecies of it, but merely a *perſonal* right, to which the pooreſt man has an equal claim with the richeſt. Now this unalienable right was in a great meaſure deſtroyed by the execrable enſlaving ſtatute of Henry the Sixth, above referred to; a ſtatute not leſs illegal than unnatural and unconſtitutional, for it paſſed without the due forms of law. It conſiſted in deſpoiling all freeholders under forty ſhillings per annum (a great ſum at that time,) of their

right

right of ſuffrage at Parliamentary elections. In aggravation of this evil, the ſervants of the crown, in whom the right of ſuffrage ought to be ſuſpended, are unnaturally and unconſtitutionally inveſted with the exerciſe of it. Secondly, by the ſame law of nature, ſcrupulouſly regarded in the eſtabliſhment of the Saxon Wittena-gemot, or aſſembly of wiſe men, the prototype of our Houſe of Commons, every man was admiſſible, though but a number greater or ſmaller, and perhaps not ſtrictly determinate, as in the caſe of our 558 members, were admitted into it. But in the preſent ſtate of our Houſe of Commons, all thoſe conſtituting the bulk of the people, who are not poſſeſſed of a certain quantum of landed property, as though an opulent knave of a landholder were an uncommon phœnomenon, are ineligible or diſqualified for election into that legiſlative aſſembly. In addition to this grievance, the miniſters and dependents of the crown are not only eligible, but elected to a ſhare of the legiſlative function in the Houſe of Commons. That this union of the legiſlative and executive powers, in the perſons of miniſters and their adherents, militates againſt the good old Saxon mode of election, is evident from the known circumſtance, that to this day a member vacates his ſeat on his acceptance of an office or emolument under the crown; but by ſtate-craft, the conſtituents are inveſted with the power of injuring themſelves, and their numerous unrepreſented

countrymen by re-electing him. Thirdly, by a declaratory law of our Saxon patriot-king Alfred, enacted in conformity to the law of nature, parliaments were to be annually elected, and oftener, if need be; a law ſo literally executed throughout the long glorious reign of the 3d Edward, comprehending more than the moiety of a century, that not a ſingle inſtance occurs of an omiſſion of annual elections. But, not to mention the unconſtitutional proceedings of the arbitrary race of the Stuarts reſpecting parliaments, in the ſixth year of the Revolution, the then Parliament dared to ſet aſide the right of annual election, and to prolong the duration of Parliament to the extent of three years, uſurping the right of the conſtituent body, and conſtituting themſelves ſelf-elected legiſlators for two years out of three. This was followed by that moſt groſs audacious infringement on the right of annual election, in the firſt year of the reign of the firſt George, which gave Parliament a ſeptennial exiſtence. In ſhort, in conſequence of inadequate and defective, inſtead of equal and univerſal parliamentary repreſentation and eligibility; in conſequence of the admiſſion of thoſe, who hold civil or judicial employments or emoluments under the crown, to a vote at Parliamentary elections, and to a ſeat in Parliament, inſtead of their excluſion from both; and in conſequence of the election of Parliaments for a duration of ſeven years,

inſtead

inſtead of a ſingle annual ſeſſion, co-operating with other abuſes of leſs note, which have crept into our political conſtitution, the miniſter of the day (I am not perſonal for or againſt any miniſter) who ought to be ſubject to the controul of the Houſe of Commons, has, as it were, inſenſibly acquired ſuch an aſcendency and influence over the members, that thro' the medium of a majority of them becoming his mercenaries, the national liberty and property may be at his ſole command and diſpoſal. And how the public money may be ſometimes miſapplied, "*under the Roſe*," in conſequence of miniſterial interference in parliamentary elections, which, when detected, ought ever to be followed up with parliamentary impeachment, is a queſtion which my countrymen may find reſolved, perhaps not much to their ſatisfaction, in a pamphlet entitled "The Trial of G— R—, Eſq. "in the Court of King's Bench," &c. printed for J. Ridgeway, York-ſtreet, St. James's-ſquare, 1791. Therefore the people of England ſhould not, and the truly wiſe among them do not, "*look on the frame of* "*their commonwealth, ſuch as it ſtands*," but ſuch as it once ſtood, and ought to ſtand, "*to be of ineſti-* "*mable value.*"

I accede to your opinion, (page 39) that "*they who* "*led at the revolution, left the crown perfectly irre-* "*ſponſible*;" and a wiſe maxim it is in our conſtitution, that the crown can do no wrong, but its mi-

niſters may. It may be true alſo that "*they aggra-*
"*vated reſponſibility on miniſters of ſtate*;" but now, through that complete ſyſtem of parliamentary corruption, which took its riſe in the penſioner-parliament, of infamous memory, in the reign of the ſecond Charles, *ſapping* the liberties of the people, which could not be *ſtormed* by his father, are not impeachment and reſponſibility become abſolute non-entities, exiſting only in the imagination? If a member of the Houſe of Commons, ſeated there neither by miniſterial nor by ariſtocratic influence, but independently elected, ſhould preſume, from the pure principle of fidelity to the cauſe of the people, for whoſe benefit alone all government ought to be inſtituted and applied, to impeach a miniſter for palpable mal-adminiſtration, he might be immediately ſcreened from reſponſibility by a packed majority, who may carry on a mercenary trade with him in penſions, places, and offices of emolument, at the expence of millions of money to the inſulted impoveriſhed public. Alas! may not the Engliſh *red book* be a grievance little leſs oppreſſive than the late French *Livre rouge*? If ſo, the one is, and the other was, very appoſitely bound in *red ſheep*, or *calf*, to denote the folly of the reſpective people, in ſubmitting to the ſuction of their national blood by court cormorants. If ſuch a grievance exiſt, and the friends of the miniſter of the day in the Houſe of Commons enjoy a conſiderable ſhare of the lucrative

contents

contents of this book, how can we confidently pronounce, with you, "*the whole government is under "the actual controul of the popular repreſentative?*" Or can we be weak enough to call that a "*popular repreſentative,*" which in fact may be a repreſentative more miniſterial and ariſtocratic than popular, and in which ſix-ſevenths of the men of age, among ſix or ſeven millions of people, are excluded from the exerciſe of their conſtitutional, and, what is of infinitely greater importance, of their natural rights of parliamentary repreſentation and eligibility?—I hope to be always open to conviction, and as much diſpoſed to retract an error as to perſiſt in a truth; but I will be free to declare, without any juſt imputation of vanity, that I have never yet ſeen any political ſcheme better calculated to reſtore and inſure reſponſibility in miniſters of ſtate, and to bring their conduct under the controul of the Houſe of Commons, inſtead of ſubjecting it to their influence, than my "Plan of a Reform of the Houſe of Commons," which is now before the public. Its principles and articles, it is to be hoped, are ſo founded in nature and the conſtitution, that, I truſt, by the divine bleſſing, they will ſoon become *faſhionable* among the middling and lower claſſes of people, who begin to be awakened to a juſt ſenſe of the natural equal unalienable rights of men. In ſhort, the plan, in conſequence of its direct aim to ſecure the rights, liber-

ties,

ties, and properties of the people, from miniſterial invaſion, tends likewiſe to maintain the crown, hitherto *electively hereditary* by the people, in the poſſeſſion of the family on the throne. It is by the formation of a national convention alone, for the purpoſe of effecting a radical reform of the Houſe of Commons, on the principles of this plan, that the body of Diſſenters can hope to obtain a repeal of the Teſt Act, which unjuſtly excludes them from eligibility to civil offices in common with churchmen. It would follow, of courſe, from ſuch a reform, which, conducted on ſuch moral principles, would be ſubſtantial, complete, and laſting. But all attempts at a partial reform, inſtead of ending in reform, give ſupport, ſtrength, and ſtability to political abuſes. If the Diſſenters could be perſuaded to ſeek their own intereſt in the eſtabliſhment of univerſal political liberty, they would avoid that ſuſpicion of being actuated rather by a ſtruggle for power, than by a principle of conſcience, which they incurred in their late unſucceſsful application to parliament, and probably would bring over moderate Churchmen to join them in the ſupport of the all-comprehenſive cauſe of reforming our political conſtitution by the ſtandard of the equal natural rights of men. By a weak and wicked policy, the lower claſſes are kept in ignorance of theſe rights; but this ignorance may be removed by the diſtribution of ſhort political catechiſms among them,

them, in the manner of Sir William Jones's excellent "Dialogue between a Scholar and a Peaſant." Well-directed endeavours to inform their minds on this intereſting ſubject will meet the approbation of all but thoſe, who, alarmed at every attempt to circulate political knowledge among the people at large, as tending to deſtroy their power, come under Iſaiah's deſcription of men, who "hunt for iniquity, and make a man an offender for a word;" as a worthy patriot experienced on his tranſlation of the ſaid celebrated Dialogue into Welch, for the benefit of the uninſtructed poor.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER VI.

The Examiner vindicates Dr. Price from the cenſure of Mr. Burke, and proves, that a king is the ſervant of the people, and that the high-ſounding Law-appellative, Sovereign Lord, implies merely the king's ſupremacy as firſt and chief magiſtrate over all ſubordinate magiſtrates. —As well king as people bound to obey the law.—The crown reſponſible in the perſon of it's miniſters, and therefore ſheltered from immediate reſponſibility.—No antiquity reſpectable but ſuch as originates in human nature.—Britons found their claim to a free conſtitution, not on the principle of inheritance from forefathers, but of birth-right from God their father; and on this principle the Revolutioniſts proceeded.

IN page 40 Dr. Price falls under your cenſure, which is his higheſt praiſe, for ſaying that "*he*," his majeſty, "*is to conſider himſelf as more properly* "*the ſervant, than the ſovereign of his people.*" It is not difficult to prove, that your reflections on this paſſage in the Doctor's Sermon are, as uſual, more replete with wit than with argument. I ſuppoſe you will admit, that ſervant and miniſter are terms ſynonymous.—In Rom. xiii. 4. it is ſaid, "He, (the power, or civil magiſtrate,) "is the miniſter of "God to thee for good,"—for the benefit, peace and ſafety of the people; not to hurt and abuſe them,—not to tyrannize over them,—not to perſecute them, or to rob them of any natural or national right.

right. Now a king may be called "the miniſter of God," becauſe from God the people derive a natural right to chuſe their own miniſter, or ſervant, in affairs relating to civil government. In a ſenſe, therefore, perfectly correſponding with my former explanation and diſtinction of government, as "the "ordinance of God" and "the ordinance of man," a king may, with propriety, be ſtiled both the miniſter, or ſervant of God, and the miniſter, or ſervant of man; as God authorizes the people to chuſe, and they, in virtue of this delegated authority, actually chuſe him for their miniſter, or ſervant.—And, in conformity to this juſt idea of a ſervant, what is tribute, or taxes, paid by the people for the ſupport of civil government, but *wages*, which they give their king, ſervant, or miniſter, for ſuch ſupport, and for the proper maintenance of himſelf for his trouble in "attending continually on this very thing." Rom. iv. 7. Moreover, to put this matter, to which you affix an importance above its intrinſic value, beyond the poſſibility of a doubt, it is a ſelf-evident truth, that the electors are the maſters, and the elected the ſervant. You ſeem to me, Sir, a zealous, if not an outrageous, advocate for the gew-gaw trappings and high ſounding titles of royalty. In counter-balance to theſe, which form a ſubject of admiration approaching to adoration, with men of little minds, and eſpecially the great-vulgar, I aſſert, that the majeſty of the people, to whom, by God's

God's permiſſion, kings owe their creation as kings, is as much ſuperior to the majeſty of the crown, as the ſtrong, dazzling, native luſtre of that glorious luminary the ſun outſhines the pale reflected light of the moon, from whom ſhe derives her borrowed ſplendour. I do not pretend to rival you in vagaries and extravaganzas, but I will hazard another aſſertion, which however *outrê* it may appear to you, is but a neceſſary inference from the former. Though a wiſe and good man would ſtudiouſly avoid the *crimen læſæ majeſtatis* in both caſes, yet *leze*-nation, or treaſon againſt the people, is more criminal than treaſon againſt the crown; and much in the ſame proportion that houſe-breaking, or highway-felony, is an offence againſt civil ſociety, more atrocious and puniſhable than petit-larceny. However, my reſpect for the firſt ſervant of the people, the king on the throne, forbids me to ſeek to diſguſt him, by calling him a ſervant. I acknowledge and eſteem him as my ſovereign, meaning by that expreſſion, the chief magiſtrate, or ſole ſupreme executor of the laws of my country, originally choſen by the people, in the perſon of the electreſs Sophia. In this ſenſe is to be underſtood that high appellative, which the law gives him, "*our Sovereign Lord the King*," or the ſupreme magiſtrate over all ſubordinate magiſtrates. But here I fix my *ne plus ultra* in this point. I cannot adulate the king; I cannot worſhip him in the common acceptation of the word worſhip; and am

happy

happy to embrace the preſent opportunity to remonſtrate againſt the ſervile court-cuſtom of addreſſing majeſty on the bended knee, when the royal hands are kiſſed on an appointment to an office civil, or dignity eccleſiaſtical. This ſupplicatory poſture ſavors too much of idol-homage, and, according to the "*ancient uſage*" of Europe, for which you ſo ſtrenuouſly contend, when it be likely to anſwer your purpoſe, ſhould be excluſively appropriated to the one God and Father of all.

In pages 41 and 42, you ſay, "*we are to obey the law in him,*" the king. You would have expreſſed yourſelf more properly, if you had ſaid, both King and people are bound to obey the law. The law claims the obedience of the people in every inſtance not flagrantly repugnant to that invariable rule, or immoveable principle of law, the protection of the natural equal rights of men. In that caſe of urgent neceſſity, it is a duty incumbent on the public, to attend to the common intereſt, by declaring, with one general voice, ſuch laws null and void, and taking efficacious meaſures to reſtore and give effect to that rule or principle, by reforming their political conſtitution, or, if abſolutely requiſite, modelling it anew.

You proceed, "*the Revolution Society chuſes to "aſſert that a king is no more than the firſt ſervant of "the public, created by it, and reſponſible to it.*" If they could have been aware of the neceſſity of guard-

ing

ing againſt your captious cavils, they would have added to the three laſt words printed by you in Italics, the following, *in the perſons of his miniſters.* When this reſponſibility is deſtroyed by miniſterial corruption in the Houſe of Commons, it becomes the duty of the people at large, if they value their lives, liberties, and properties, to re-eſtabliſh it, by engaging, with unanimous conſent, in that one neceſſary meaſure, a radical reform of this legiſlative aſſembly, on the equitable, benevolent, liberal principles, recommended in my plan to that purpoſe. This would ſecure the reſponſibility of miniſters in the moſt effectual manner, and conſequently, in compliance with the wiſe proviſion of our conſtitution, ſhelter the crown itſelf from reſponſibility, which, in the nature of things, muſt be reſponſible to the public, if its miniſters be irreſponſible.

In page 44 you contend, that "*the revolution was made to preſerve our* ANCIENT *indiſputable laws and liberties, and that* ANCIENT *conſtitution of government, which is our only ſecurity for law and liberty.*" It is remarkable you chuſe to deal in *generals*, and not to deſcend to *particulars*, probably hoping thereby to ſhelter your real meaning from detection; elſe you would not ſcruple to ſpecify the preciſe ſenſe you affix to your epithet *ancient*. Do you mean "*our ancient laws and liberties, and ancient conſtitution of government,*" as they came pure and unadulterated from the hands of our Saxon progenitors?

or

or as they were afterwards impaired and vitiated by the pernicious incorporation of the baſe ſlaviſh fœdal ſyſtem of polity, compulſively introduced by the Norman invader, whoſe memory we are bound more to execrate than bleſs ?—Your expreſſions of fondneſs for the ages of chivalry and fealty, occaſionally interſperſed in your work, afford me abundant reaſon to ſuſpect your partiality for the latter. But be that as it may, much as I reſpect the mild free Saxon conſtitution of government, its mere *antiquity* has no weight with me. I know no other *antiquity*, I reſpect no other "*ancient laws and liberties*," no other "*ancient conſtitution of government*," than thoſe which have their ſource in our very nature as men. An *antiquity* this coeval with our offspring from Adam; or, as it is beautifully and conciſely expreſſed by that acute reaſoner, Mr. Capel Loft, in his Remarks on your Reflections, (page 31) "an inheritance coeval with the commencement of humanity," and conſequently, through the divinely-eſtabliſhed inſtrumentality of human procreation, derived from God, his and our father. We do not found our claim to liberty, and to the enjoyment of our property, and of every perſonal right on any poſitive conſtitution of government, *ancient* or modern, but we fix it on that ſolid undeſtructible baſis the rock of nature. We vindicate our claim to a free government on this baſis only, the inherent law of our nature. Whenever the deſtruction of this free govern-

ment ſhall be, as it has hertofore been, endangered, from whatever cauſe the danger may ariſe, whether originating in ſome one of the three branches of government ſingly, in two of them combinedly, or in all jointly, this ſea-girt iſle, if its inhabitants can but ſummon ſpirit ſufficient to unite in defending their natural equal rights as men from invaſion, will riſe ſuperior to an hoſt of internal foes, and reſembling the "*rupes infixa mari*," of Virgil, *quæ immota reſiſtit ventorum furies circumlatrantibus undis*," will brave and defy the tempeſtuous rage and roar of turbulent contending ſtate-parties, or even of legiſlators and kings, when leagued againſt the common intereſt, peace, and ſafety. The people of this country will, in ſuch an uhhappy emergency, which may God of his infinite mercy avert! give demonſtrable evidence to Mr. Burke, if he be living, that the "*ancient conſtitution of government is*" not "*our only "ſecurity for law and liberty.*" You miſtake in declaring that "*we wiſhed at the period of the Revolution, and do now wiſh, to derive all we poſſeſs, as an inheritance from our forefathers.*" "*We derive all we poſſeſs*," or rather all we ought to poſſeſs, in our political conſtitution, not "*as an inheritance from our forefathers*," but as our birth-right by nature, as an inheritance from God our father. The adherence, imperfect as it was, to the outlines of the conſtitution "*at the period of the Revolution*," is an argument, which militates againſt your aſſertion. It is merely

a proof

a proof, that the Saxon form of government, in its native purity and ſimplicity, is ſo friendly to, and as it were, congenial with, the natural rights of men, that *ſome* regard was paid to it by thoſe who were concerned in the buſineſs of the Revolution. I uſe the word *ſome* regard and *imperfect* adherence to the ancient Saxon form of government, becauſe it is not difficult to prove, that our Revolutioniſts were more attentive to the full preſervation of that harſh Norman feudal ſyſtem of polity, which you ſo much admire, but which, by its unſightly intermixture, has defaced the beautiful ſimplicity with its corrupt leaven, poiſoned the purity, and with its vile alloy debaſed the ſterling ore of our free mild Saxon conſtitution. And here I ſhall by the bye remark, that in the ſhort ſpace of ſix years from the æra of 1688, the then-Parliament uſurping the right of the conſtituent body, ſcrupled not to deſpoil the people of their natural and conſtitutional right to annually elected Parliaments, by their triennial bill, and thereby violated the 13th of the articles contained in the declaration of rights, paſſed into an act at the time of the Revolution, viz, "that for the redreſs of all grievances," &c. "Parliaments ought to be held frequently;" if by "held frequently" be meant *elected annually*, and in no other ſenſe can the words be underſtood, conſiſtently with "*ancient uſage*," Mr. Burke's hobby-horſe, on which, when it ſerves his purpoſe, he rides poſt-haſte into deſpotiſm, our Saxon

anceſtors being too wiſe to delegate the important truſt of legiſlation for a whole people to one ſet of men for a longer term than a ſingle ſeſſion. This ſeſſion was uſually of an annual duration, but never was protracted beyond the period of a year; and in the reign of the third Edward inſtances can be produced of the election of new Parliaments, twice, thrice, and even oftener in a year. How would our venerable "thrum-capped anceſtors," as Pope calls them, be aſtoniſhed, confounded, grieved, and aſhamed of their degenerate poſterity, were they to ſtart from their graves, and become eye-witneſſes of our egregious folly in giving a ſeptennial exiſtence to our legiſlators, at the ſame time that in private, far leſs intereſting than public concerns, not one opulent landholder of common ſenſe can be found, who does not, with ſcrupulous minuteneſs, inſpect the accounts of his ſteward, every half-year or oftener.

But whatever adherence, or regard to the ancient Saxon form of government may be viſible in the conduct of our Revolutioniſts, it is not true, that, (page 45) "*they proceeded upon the principle of refe-*"*rence to antiquity*," or "*carefully formed the Revo-*"*lution upon analogical precedent, authority, and ex-*"*ample, conſidering their moſt ſacred rights and fran-*"*chiſes as an inheritance from our forefathers.*" No! they proceeded on this principle, the conformity of our Saxon laws and inſtitutions to the natural equal rights of men, rights more really ancient, if antiquity

be

be of any eſtimation, than any the moſt ancient poſitive form of government. But it is very immaterial, whether the Revolutioniſts proceeded on this principle, or not. I hope the people of Britain will gradually acquire, if they have not already acquired, a competent knowledge of the ſource and end of all government, namely, that it *originates in their choice, for the purpoſe of their protection*, and that they do not found their claim to the enjoyment of their invaluable, unalienable rights and liberties, on any idea of an inheritance, of a pedigree, or genealogical tree, of liberties derived from their anceſtors, but on that dubitable *moſt ancient* inheritance their birthright as men. I will ſpeak more plainly, and aver, that, if it were poſſible to ſuppoſe the peculiar caſe could ariſe, that their elective-hereditary crown in the perſons of the family on the throne became literally incompatible with the preſervation of the natural rights of the people, to the poſſeſſion of life, liberty, and property, they inherit from their very nature an indiſputable title to chuſe a form of government which they think better calculated to inſure the national ſecurity, liberty, and welfare: But my Plan of an Houſe of Commons, formed on the natural and Chriſtian principles of univerſal equity, benevolence, and liberty, effectually guards againſt the contingent poſſibility of the occurrence of this peculiar caſe, becauſe by the direct tendency of its articles in general to deſtroy miniſterial influence

in that national legiſlative aſſembly, and of thoſe in particular which ſtipulate for the excluſion of the miniſters of the crown from a ſhare of the legiſlative function, both as elector and repreſentatives, and the conſequent confinement of them to their ſole proper province, the adminiſtration of the executive power of the crown, the reſponſibility of miniſters is ſo completely ſecured, and their conduct moſt effectually ſubjected to the controul of the Houſe. In truth, in providing for this reſponſibility by the propoſed incapacitation of miniſters for ſuffrage as conſtituents, and for election as repreſentatives, I had in view as well the continuance and ſecurity of the electively hereditary crown in the Houſe of Hanover, as the preſervation and protection of national rights and liberties. Every man of common ſenſe and of common reflection cannot but ſee, at the firſt glance, that this leading meaſure, in cooperation with the reſt propoſed in the plan for liberating the Houſe of Commons from the ignominious bondage of a mercenary dependence on adminiſtration, is well adapted to inſure both theſe happy effects. So indiſſolubly linked together are the true intereſts of the crown and of the people, however time-ſerving miniſterialiſts and equally ſelfiſh oppoſitioniſts may wiſh, and under plauſible pretexts, craftily and too ſucceſsfully labour to ſet them at variance.

Actuated more by a zeal for *renovation*, or a recurrence to the firſt principles of the conſtitution of nature, than by a "*a ſpirit of innovation*," which it might

might be eaſily proved, you (in page 47) improperly condemn, as "*generally the reſult of a ſelfiſh temper* "*and confined views*," I ſhall not heſitate to acknowledge that, when I behold a man of the world diſclaiming in words (at page 37) the old exploded doctrine, "*that the crown is held by divine, heredi-* "*tary, and indefeaſible right*," yet artfully introducing it under a new form, and, as it were, tricking my countrymen into it, by clothing it in the new dreſs of "*ancient uſage—preſcription—precedent—authority—* "*example*—and *entailed inheritance—derived to us* "*from our forefathers*—my breaſt ſwells with indignation, and I am rouſed by a ſenſe of duty to the public, to endeavour to counteract the miſchievous effects of ſuch ſubtle management. Let it be your boaſt to *declaim* in favour of our political conſtitution, "*as it now ſtands*," and to *exclaim* againſt every attempt at improvement, even in the very neceſſary article of Parliamentary repreſentation, in its preſent ſtate ſhamefully inadequate and defective. It ſhall be my glory to oppoſe ſuch pernicious declamation and exclamation; to vindicate in general the inherent right of every people to chuſe that form of government which they think moſt expedient, uſeful, and conducive to the preſervation of the natural equal rights of the whole community; and to aſſert, in particular, the right of my countrymen to engage in the taſk, not arduous, if will and ſpirit be not wanting, of a ſubſtantial, and rigorouſly com-

plete reform of the Houſe of Commons, as being the ſureſt and ſafeſt means to avoid the ſlavery of deſpotiſm on the one hand, and the anarchy of a revolution on the other.

You could not, Sir, have taken more true pains to diſſerve this cauſe of the electively-hereditary crown than by, as it were, Jeſuitically bringing in indirectly, and by a ſide wind, the blaſphemous antiquated *jure-divino* right of tyrants, under covert of "*conſidering* "(page 49) *our liberties in the light of an inheritance* "*from our forefathers*" only, as though we had no other title to them, than (page 46) "*this poſitive recorded hereditary title*;" as though we had not a title to them paramount to that ariſing from any, the beſt eſtabliſhed political conſtitution; as though we had not an inconteſtable title to them as the creatures of our good Creator and Father, who never deſigned his children ſhould be ſlaves, however a few of their wicked fellow-creatures have been hitherto permitted, for wiſe and good ends, to counteract his more than parental tenderneſs, by ſubjecting them more or leſs to their deſpotic ſway.

Page 47, Your pomp and parade of "*an inheritable* "*crown, an inheritable peerage, and an Houſe of Commons* "*and a people inheriting privileges, franchiſes, and* "*liberties, from a long line of anceſtors*," are but as the mere duſt of the balance when weighed in the ſcales againſt the preponderating title to rights and liberties, which the people inherit from the God of nature

nature. Happily an improvement in the knowledge of political liberty, and in a juſt ſenſe of the natural equal rights of men, keeps pace with the advancement of arts and ſciences in general. How far our French neighbours and friends; (for I truſt they love us and we love them too well to ſuffer the enemies of both to perſuade them to regard each other as hereditary foes, however their reſpective courts may have hitherto with too great ſucceſs inculcated this ſavage ſanguinary idea,) may have profited by this knowledge in the formation of their infantine free conſtitution, which I ſincerely wiſh may be gradually matured into a Coloſſus in ſtrength, I mean to examine, as far as it has come within my confined knowledge and obſervation. Moreover, by way of counterbalance to the freedom of your remarks, to the diſparagement of their Revolution, which you ſeem to condemn in them, though our hiſtoric page will furniſh us with an inſtance of treating a deſpotic king with more ſeverity than their ſixteenth Louis has experienced, I ſhall intereſt myſelf, as "*a truly Chriſtian politician*," in their welfare, by furniſhing them with ſuch hints, as may tend to improve and perfect their free conſtitution.

Your Reflections on the French Revolution, whether I find them deſerving of a ſerious anſwer, or to be only ſlightly or ſlightingly noticed, as the mere whip-ſyllabub froth of flippant, flimſy declamation, will give me frequent opportunities, in the

progreſs

progreſs of my animadverſions, to introduce theſe hints, which, if the French and their National Aſſembly judge to be founded on the liberal benevolent principles of ſound political morality, they may form into a regular uniform plan, or not, as they ſhall think proper. Were I to receive in ſecret what you call "*a dole*," or an eleemoſynary pecuniary gratification for thus loving "*to diſpenſe benefits*," I ſhould eſteem that dole as more honourable, and redounding more to my credit, than the penſions of thouſands per annum, which government beſtows on its favourites, at the expence of an exhauſted public, till I am acquainted with the extraordinary merits, on which the penſioners found their pretenſions to theſe ample doceurs.

My labours in the ſervice of the French ſhall be entirely voluntary, and not mercenary; and I think the heart-felt ſatisfaction reſulting from them will be equal to that which others may enjoy from any private wiſh, or printed public attempt, to bring the French nation again under the yoke of hierarchic and ariſtocratic domination, more to be dreaded than regal deſpotiſm.

From the words in page 51, "*You might have derived your claim from a more early race of anceſtors*," as alſo from thoſe in page 52, "*Had you made it to "be underſtood that you were reſolved to reſume your "ancient privileges*," it is evident that you conſiſtently, though erroneouſly, found the title, as well of the

the French as of Britons, to the enjoyment of a free conſtitution of government, under your very reſtrained ideas of freedom, on ancient uſage, diſregarding the more venerable ſacred antiquity, deducible from the natural equal rights of men. In vindication of this truth, and of the primæval right of mankind, deſcendable to their moſt remote poſterity, to chuſe their own form of government, and to reform it, or even totally change it, when ſuch reform or ſuch change ſhall be found more conducive to public utility, and to the ſecurity of equal liberty, the end of all government, what I have urged in our caſe equally applies to the ſituation of our neighbours on the other ſide of the Channel, and therefore I ſhall not diſguſt my readers with a needleſs repetition. I ſhall content myſelf with offering the National Aſſembly my tribute of praiſe for having proceeded in the formation of their new government rather on the ſound ſolid principles of the unalienable natural rights of men, than on the tottering baſis of "*the almoſt obliterated conſtitution of their anceſtors*," (page 53) or on the not very "*wiſe example of "their neighbours in this land.*" The members of our Houſe of Commons are ſo much more expoſed to the temptation of enliſting under the mercenary banner of the miniſter of the day, than circumſtanced ſo as to anſwer the end of their election, by acting without reſtraint in the juſt and honourable capacity of upright legiſlators for the national benefit of

ſix

ſix or ſeven millions of people, that, were I not convinced, you do not indulge in your uſual vein of irony in the following paſſage, "*by following wiſe "examples, you would have given new examples of "wiſdom to the world,*" I might have been led to think that your printer had inadvertently incurred an *erratum*, by omitting to put in italics, the adjective "*wiſe,*" and the ſubſtantive "*wiſdom.*"

CHAP.

CHAPTER VII.

Quere, whether a proviſion for the education of the infant-poor in ſchools of religion, morals, and induſtry, be not preferable to civil eſtabliſhments in religion.—The French National Aſſembly generous vindicators of religious liberty.—Mr. Burke's MERCIFUL *rejection of the petition of certain of the clergy and laity to the Houſe of Commons, for relief from the burthen of ſubſcription to the Thirty-nine Articles, founded on his abſurd, inconſiſtent principle of an* ESTABLISHMENT TIGHT, *and a* TOLERATION LARGE.—*Mr. Burke's poſition, that a moral politician can be deluſively plauſible, controverted.—Mr. Burke's rigour exemplified in his too literal interpretation of the declaration of the Parliament of Paris to their king.—Diſcuſſion of Mr. Burke's aſſertion, that the French rebel againſt a mild and lawful monarch.—Summum jus ſumma injuria.—Mr. Burke's reſiſtance to conceſſion and revolt from protection expoſed.—Proved that Mr. Burke ſhould have annexed to his favourite, the Gallic church, the active participle,* PILLAGING, *inſtead of the paſſive participle,* PILLAGED.

YOU aſſert, in page 54, "*All other nations have* "*begun the fabric of a new government, or the* "*reformation of an old, by eſtabliſhing originally, or by* "*enforcing with greater exactneſs, ſome rites or other of* "*religion.*" Can the civil magiſtrate claim a right to interfere in matters merely religious?—Does he not in ſo doing uſurp a power, which excluſively appertains to God only? And, if the civil magiſtrate

trate cannot, ſo alſo the nation, or community at large in any country, cannot, without a manifeſt invaſion of God's prerogative, "*eſtabliſh originally*, "*or enforce with greater exactneſs*," with what you may term wholeſome pains and penalties, "*ſome* "*rites or other of religion.*" The mind of man ought to be left at liberty to acknowledge and worſhip God or not; and if it determine in favour of ſuch acknowledgment and worſhip, to worſhip him in private, or in public with his neighbours, and to join with them in ſupporting preachers by voluntary contribution or not, as his judgment ſhall decide to be moſt conducive to his own moral improvement or religious edification, particularly, with reſpect to the Chriſtian revelation. Can it admit the ſhadow of a doubt, that, if our good God and father had deſigned a nation at large, or the creature of their choice, the civil power, ſhould interfere in the eſtabliſhment of religious rites or opinions, he would have commiſſioned his meſſenger Chriſt to define the nature and extent of ſuch interference, mark the preciſe boundaries where the national authority, or that of the civil magiſtrate, in religious concerns, begins and ends? But, as the Scriptures are not only ſilent on this important point, but Paul, 2 Cor. i. 24, expreſsly renounces apoſtolic "dominion "over the faith" of his Corinthian converts, and, as I before remarked, Gallio, the Roman proconſul of Achaia, ſets an example worthy of imitation by all

civil

civil magiſtrates, in every age and country, in the inſtance of his diſclaiming a right to meddle with religious matters, in the caſe of the Jews, is it not a point indiſputably certain, that national communities and their governors ſhould confine themſelves to their own civil or political province? Are not the limits of this province tranſgreſſed, when nations, or their governors, exceed the two following points, which are more properly of a civil than of a religious nature, namely, firſt the appointment of one day in ſeven as a day of reſt from labour, without the eſtabliſhment or enforcement of any form or ſpecies of religious worſhip; and, ſecondly, a proviſion for the inſtruction of the infant poor, in the ſchools of religion, morals, and induſtry; leaving their teachers to the full exerciſe of their judgment in the two former particulars, but recommending to them an attention to the Chriſtian religion, as calculated to train children into uſeful members of the community, in conſequence of the pure morality it contains, and of which the practice is enforced by that moſt prevailing motive, the hope of eternal life and happineſs? When thus inſtructed, and apprenticed at the public charge to ſuch worldly occupations as ſuit their reſpective talents, ſhould not theſe *eleves* of the public be put into complete poſſeſſion of their natural right to chooſe their own religion? for God requires not a forced worſhip, but the voluntary homage of the heart. The National Aſſem-

bly

bly of France, therefore, have acted on the true principles of liberty, religious and political, and consequently deserve the grateful acknowledgments of the friends of freedom throughout this *sublunary terraqueous* globe, (to have said *the world*, would have been sufficient, but I love to gratify you in your predilection for high-sounding epithets) in not "*enforcing with greater exactness, in their fabric of a* "*new government, some rites or other of religion.*" Religion with these generous vindicators of the liberty of the human mind is as free as air, unshackled, unmanacled by human authority. How uncharitable and narrow-minded does your behaviour to the clerical petitioners appear, when contrasted with the benevolent and liberal conduct of the National Assembly? When some one or other of my brethren of the committee, applied to you about eighteen years since in favour of their petition to the then House of Commons, for redress from the grievance of subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, you dismissed him or them with an answer exactly, or nearly, in the following words, "I would have "*an establishment tight*, and a *toleration large.*" How merciful this answer to a respectable body of conscientious clergy and laity, petitioning, in a legal, respectful manner, not to be tied down *tight*, in the enlightened eighteenth century, to the subscription of an *human* body of *divinity*, compiled by our less informed forefathers of the sixteenth, as a necessary qualification

qualification for academical matriculation and graduation, and for epiſcopal ordination and eccleſiaſtical preferment! A ſyſtem of faith this compriſing article, ſome, in the judgment of many, idolatrous; ſome contradictory; and ſome unintelligible. Your approbation of "*enforcing with greater exactneſs ſome rites or other of religion*," is in perfect uniſon with your idea of a *tight* civil eſtabliſhment in religion, an idea founded in abſurdity and inconſiſtency. Happily for the peace and comfort of the world, the French revolutioniſts have proceeded upon more equitable, liberal, and benevolent principles. But though you refuſe to grant the clergy of the eſtabliſhment in England the leaſt relaxation in the affair of ſubſcription, I hope you practically adhere to your doctrine of a "*toleration large*," and that you do not grudge "*the noble ſeekers*" the enjoyment of their liberty, "*to ſet up, each of them, a ſeparate meeting-houſe upon his own particular principles.*" But I deteſt the idea of man's preſumption, in only tolerating that which God freely grants, namely, that every man ſhould worſhip him according to his knowledge and the dictates of his conſcience. The unreſtrained exerciſe of the univerſal right of conſcience is not leſs man's unalienably juſt claim in religious concerns, than the undiſturbed enjoyment of the univerſal right of citizenſhip is in political.

In page 55 you ſpeak of "*the deluſive plauſibilities of moral politicians.*" To this I anſwer, there can

be no deluſive plauſibility in morality; and the politician who is guilty of a deluſive plauſibility, is not in that inſtance a moral politician.

"*Remember that your Parliament of Paris told your "king, that, in calling the ſtates together, he had nothing "to fear but the prodigal exceſs of their zeal in provi- "ding for the ſupport of the throne.*" Here *tight* and rigorous, as in the caſe of civil eſtabliſhments in religion, internally rigorous, in a manner correſponding with (page 313) your own acknowledged external "rigid fibres," which probably more frequently ſtiffen into a grin than relax into a ſmile, you make not the leaſt grain of allowance for that propenſity to exaggeration, which is natural to the ardour and vivacity of the French. This declaration of the Parliament, when ſtripped of the amplification of hyperbole, implied nothing more than that the "*ſtates*" would "*provide*" in a liberal manner "*for "the ſupport of the throne,*" and not that under this pretext, the king, queen, and his royal brothers, ſhould be empowered, as they had hitherto been, to draw for unlimited ſums on the treaſury, or that the ſole duty and buſineſs either of the ſtates, or of the Parliament of Paris, was to regiſter the royal edicts for the purpoſe of fleecing the people of their property, at the royal will and pleaſure.

Page 56, "*They,*" the Parliament of Paris, "*have "ſeen the French rebel againſt a mild and lawful monarch.*" It is generally acknowledged, that the French

French King is of a mild diſpoſition, but of what benefit is his mildneſs to the French people, if the natural effects of it be liable to be thwarted or overpowered by the leſs meek temper of male or female favourites? I admit that, in your very contracted ſenſe of the expreſſion, the French King was a "*lawful monarch.*" He was ſuch by the *unjuſt* law of the land, as it then ſtood. But, when I contemplate this matter in its juſt and more enlarged point of view, and conſider that *ſummum jus* is often *ſumma injuria*; or what is ſtrictly legal, according to poſitive law, is, when ſet in compariſon with the law of nature, not merely illegal, but, conſcientiouſly examined, very criminal, I deny that he was "*a lawful monarch.*" In this only rational ſenſe no man can be ſuch; for the dictates of the law of nature, prior and paramount to all poſitive law, remonſtrate againſt the inveſtment of the legiſlative, judicial, and executive powers of government in one and the ſame individual. Nature cries aloud to man, "Under "ſuch monopoly of the three powers, the will of the "monarch being his only law, your natural equal "rights cannot be maintained, and your lives, liber-"ties, and properties muſt ever lie at the mercy of "his deſpotic pleaſure and caprice, unleſs a fellow-"creature were as morally perfect in kind as his "Creator is perfect in degree. But reverſe this "monopoly, ſeparate the three powers, and lodge "them in the hands of different individuals, ſo as

"that they ſhall not interfere with each other, any "farther than by a proviſion for the ſecurity of the "real reſponſibility of the executive and judicial to "the legiſlative power, compoſed of men deputed by "annual national election for the exerciſe of it, and "the people will be ſafe, free, proſperous, and "happy." "*The French*" therefore, according to this fair repreſentation of things, did not "*rebel* "*againſt a lawful monarch*" but vindicated their claim to the enjoyment of the natural rights of men againſt an illegal deſpot.

"*Their reſiſtance was made to conceſſion, their* "*revolt was from protection,*" and more to the like purpoſe. This is all very ſpecious, and exactly in the ſtyle of the plauſible Mr. Burke; but I am inclined to think, the "*conceſſion*" was extorted by the dread of the conſequences of the increaſing ſpirit and firmneſs of the truly patriotic Parliament of Paris; and, if the regular troops, inſtead of joining (to their immortal honour) the cauſe of the people, had obeyed the ſanguinary orders of the court, it is more than probable, that the enſuing horrible ſcene of carnage would have juſtified my putting a negative on your aſſertion, that "*their revolt was from protection.*"

"*A church pillaged.*" I would rather have ſaid, *a reſtoration to the ſtate of what had been pillaged from it by the church.* The church, in alliance with the civil power, and ever ready to ſupport its moſt deſpotic principles, pretenſions, and practices,

availing

availing itſelf of the fears of credulous ſuperſtition, had, in more dark and ignorant ages than the preſent, plundered the nation of a very conſiderable portion of the faireſt and moſt fertile lands of France. How then can the reſumption of theſe lands by the National Aſſembly, for the national benefit, be traduced and vilified as a pillage, eſpecially as they ſecure a competent income, as well to the regular or monaſtic, as to the ſecular or parochial clergy, the Abbès and Vicars.

CHAPTER VIII.

Wiſdom of melting down the three orders into one in the ſtates general.---Mr. Burke's unfavourable account of the members of the tiers-etat, and of the repreſentatives of the clergy and nobility.—Mr. Burke repreſents the National Aſſembly as governed by the law-members, and they by an oligarchy of degraded nobility.—Thoſe of the French nobility, who joined in the deſtruction of their own order, vindicated from the aſperſions of Mr. Burke, and entitled to a badge of merit.---To level and to equalize terms ſynonimous.---All men equal.---Mr. Burke's perverſion of the word uſurpation.---The words of the Chancellor of France to be taken in their ſtrict literal ſenſe.—No diſtinction between man and man but what ariſes from pre-eminence in integrity.---Road to power ought to be open alike to all.---The only due and adequate legiſlative repreſentation of a people is univerſal and equal PERSONAL *repreſentation.---Repreſentation of property abſurd, and would tend to arm the rich with the power to oppreſs the poor.—Mr. Burke's aſſertion, that inequality is the characteriſtical eſſence of property, proved to be erroneous.---Mr. Burke reſumes his reflections on the Revolution Society.---The cauſe of liberty in Britain, to which the example of France is auſpicious, ſtated.*

PAGE 60, "*In the calling of the ſtates general of* "*France the great departure from the ancient courſe* "*by melting down,*" as you term it, "*the three orders* "*into one,*" though, as an avowed friend to the French hierarchy and ariſtocracy, it meet not your approbation,

bation, was a maſter-ſtroke of neceſſary policy; for, though "*the repreſentation for the third eſtate*" might be "*compoſed of* 600 *perſons, and they equal in* "*number to the repreſentatives of both the other orders,*" yet "*if the three orders were to act ſeparately, the tiers-etat*" (page 61) inſtead of having "*the power of* "*the other two thrown into their hands,*" would have derived no advantage from this equality of number of repreſentatives, becauſe the nobility and clergy, ever attentive to their own excluſive intereſt, would have out-voted the tiers-etat in the proportion of two to one; and conſequently the repreſentatives of the people being thus reduced to mere cyphers, the public ſafety, welfare, and liberty would have been neglected, and ſacrificed to the ambition and avarice of magnats and eccleſiaſtics.

Page 67, "*The compoſition of the third eſtate, as it* "*ſtood in its original frame,*" prior to the conſolidation of the three orders into one, you ſet in no very favourable point of view, repreſenting it as "*formed in a very* "*great proportion,*" (you add, *a majority*, I believe) "*of practitioners in the the law, not of diſtinguiſhed* "*magiſtrates, not of leading advocates, not of renowned* "*profeſſors in univerſities, but of the inferior, unlearned,* "*mechanical, inſtrumental members of the profeſſion,* "*of obſcure provincial advocates, of ſtewards of petty* "*local juriſdictions, country attornies, notaries, &c.*" With theſe, whom you, I ſuppoſe, diſdain to denominate *gentlemen* of the law, you aſſociate, (page 63)

"*an handful of country clowns, ſome of whom are ſaid*
"*not to be able to read and write; not a greater number*
"*of traders, who had never known any thing beyond*
"*their compting-houſe; a pretty conſiderable proportion*
"*of the faculty of medicine, not habituated to ſentiments*
"*of dignity; the dealers* (page 64) *in ſtocks and funds,*
"*eager to change ideal paper-wealth for the ſolid*
"*ſubſtance of land;*" and laſtly, "*men of other de-*
"*ſcriptions, men formed to be inſtruments, not controuls.*
"*Such in general,*" you remark, "*was the compoſition*
"*of the tiers-etat in the National Aſſembly.*"

With reſpect to "*the repreſentatives of the clergy,*" you aſſert the "*election was ſo contrived as to ſend a*
"*very large proportion of mere country curates to the*
"*great and arduous work of new modelling a ſtate,*" intimating, in the true ſpirit of that deſpicable character, a man of the world, that their ignorance of the world, and "*hopeleſs poverty,*" diſqualified them for the taſk; and not diſcerning that a man of the world is a man moſt incapacitated for new modelling a ſtate, on the only principles, on which a ſtate ought to be formed or reformed, the principles of ſound political morality, of univerſal equity, benevolence, and liberty. Here, by the bye, learned as you confeſſedly are, you betray your ignorance of the French word *Curès*, which means not unbeneficed officiating clergymen or curates, in the Engliſh ſenſe of the word, but the ſecular or parochial beneficed clergy, and is, I apprehend a ſynonime to *Abbès*.

The

The ſubſtantive *Vicaire*, *Anglicè Vicar*, correſponds to Curate.

The order of nobility in the National Aſſembly, you deſcribe (pages 68—70) as compoſed of "*turbulent diſcontented men of quality*," who, "*puffed* "*up with perſonal pride and arrogance, deſpiſe their own* "*order, ſacrifice all ideas of dignity to an ambition* "*without a diſtinct object, and work with low inſtru-* "*ments and for low ends.*"

Now, Sir, if this be a true delineation, which reſts merely on your *ipſe dixit*, of the component parts of the National Aſſembly, in its original ſtate of three ſeparate orders, I apprehend it has not undergone a ſenſibly material change in its new organization, in conſequence of blending the three orders in one, and ſinking the church and nobility into the maſs of the people at large. As well now therefore as then, perhaps more, according to your account, "*ſince*" your much lamented, "*deſtruction of the orders*," thoſe members of the aſſembly who come under your polite deſcription of "*country clowns, traders,* "*profeſſors of medecine, dealers in ſtocks and funds, men* "*of other deſcriptions, and country curates*," inſtead "*of balancing the power of the active chicaners*," the law-members, "*add a preponderating weight to the* "*force of the body chicane*," and are ſubject to their power and controul, in ſhort are "*overborn and ſway-ed by the artifices and intrigues of lawyers.*" Theſe again who formed the majority of the aſſembly, you

repreſent

repreſent " *inevitably become in their turn ſubſervient* " *to the worſt deſigns, to the ſelfiſh and miſchievous ambi-* " *tion of individuals, in the claſs of nobility.*" Thus have you, with wonderful art and dexterity, contrived, that the other members of the aſſembly, the clerical not excepted, ſhould be daſhed againſt the Scylla of law, and the law-members in their turn ſwallowed up in the Charybdis of nobility. In one word, cloſely tracing you through the labyrinth of declamation, (from page 61 to page 68, incluſive) after much doubling, turning, and winding, I find you reſolving the whole legiſlative power of the National Aſſembly into an oligarchy of degraded nobility. However, unfortunately for you, admitting the truth of your ſtatement of the component parts of the conſtituting National Aſſembly, it is much to the honour of "*the body chicane and the turbulent diſcontented* "*men of quality*," that both have had ſufficient influence over the other members, to prevail on them to concur in the final eſtabliſhment of a free conſtitution of government, undaunted by the threats and intrigues of a powerful league, formed of ſelf-exiled ariſtocrats and hierarchs, headed by the King's Brothers and Princes of the Blood.

" *One of the firſt ſymptoms, the turbulent diſcontented* " *men of quality diſcover, of a ſelfiſh and miſchievous* " *ambition, is a profligate diſregard of a dignity which* " *they partake with others.*" The few men of rank in France, who not only did not oppoſe, but cordially

join

join the late conſtituting National Aſſembly, in the deſtruction of their own order, are men truly noble; and if I were happy in the perſonal knowledge of any one member of the preſent legiſlative National Aſſembly, I would not ſcruple to ſolicit him to move the following decree:—" Decreed, that thoſe of the nobility, " who evinced a magnanimous diſregard of their own " order, by ſupporting the French nation, and their " aſſembly, in the abolition of it, ſhall be permitted, " as a public teſtimony of their merit, to wear a " badge of diſtinction on their dreſs, decorated with " the following motto, *Nobilitas ſola eſt atque unica virtus.*"—We reſemble, Sir, two parallel lines, which run on, *ad infinitum*, without ever meeting. To the diſregard of their dignity, which theſe patriotic noblemen have demonſtrated, you apply the epithet "*profligate*;" I, on the contrary, glory in pronouncing it *generous*. You attach to their conduct, in this inſtance, the charge of being actuated by " *a ſelfiſh miſchievous ambition.*" I regard it as the effect of a *diſintereſted and uſeful emulation*. "Stemmata quid proſunt, quid prodeſt, Pontice, longo. Sanguine cenſeri, pictoſque oſtendere vultus majorum?" Having lent my claſſic authors to a very near young relation, I cite by memory from Horace or Juvenal. Theſe great men, imitating the Roman ſatiriſt in his contempt of a noble anceſtry, have acquired immortal fame, by voluntarily blending them, themſelves, and their poſterity, with the maſs of the people

at

at large, conſcious, that the order of nobility is a treſpaſs on the natural equal rights of men.

Page 72, "*Thoſe who attempt to level, never equalize.*" To level and to equalize are ſynonimous, *exempli gratia*; the pooreſt man is on an equality, or on a level with the richeſt.

"*In all ſocieties conſiſting of various deſcriptions of "citizens, ſome deſcription muſt be uppermoſt.*" I cannot diſcern the neceſſity that any one deſcription of citizens ſhould be uppermoſt. If by any means they attain any other diſtinction or ſuperiority than what ariſes from a pre-eminence in integrity, they are filled with arrogance, inſolence, and a contempt of their ſuppoſed inferiors, and ought to be inſtantly humbled, and reduced to their proper level.

Your *bizarre* imagination is ſo captivated with the viſionary idea that every political conſtitution, whither friendly or hoſtile to the good of mankind, ſhould be maintained in its original ſtate, without the leaſt improvement from the improved ſtate of man's knowledge in the ſcience of equal political liberty, and that there is no admiſſible principle of government but that of ancient inheritance from forefathers, which is no more than a revival of the old exploded doctrine of divine right, in a new dreſs, that you more than inſinuate, that the new political conſtitution of France, which is founded in the equal rights of men, is "*the worſt of uſurpa-*" *tions, an uſurpation on the prerogatives of nature,*"

when

when, in fact, it is regulated by the ſtandard of nature.

When "*the Chancellor of France ſaid, that all occupations were honourable,*" I ſcorn to queſtion his ſincerity, or to ſuſpect that he did not mean what he ſaid, in the ſtrict ſenſe of the words, and not that their literal meaning ſhould be refined away by you into "*an oratorical flouriſh,*" or mere deception.

I do not wonder that you, whoſe head is replete with high ariſtocratic notions, ſhould not think "*any thing honourable,*" without "*ſome*" fancied "*diſtinction in its favour.*" I deſpiſe your low grovelling idea of annexing, though, to do you juſtice, you do not "*confine power, authority, and diſtinction to blood, and names, and titles.*" He only is with me a man of honour, who is a man of integrity; and, conſequently, he only is entitled to power, authority, and diſtinction. No "*ſtate can ſuffer oppreſſion,*" which makes its choice of legiſlators from thoſe individuals who are moſt pre-eminent in this neceſſary virtue, without the leaſt regard to occupation or employment. With reſpect to ability, common ſenſe is ſufficient to direct a man to legiſlate for the benefit of the community, when the legiſlative power is ſo framed, that he is ſecured from all temptation to ſacrifice it to his own private emolument. From theſe truths, or, to adopt the faſhionable parliamentary expreſſion, from theſe *truiſms* reſpecting integrity and ability, I ſhall deduce this inference,

inference, that your aſſertion (page 74) that "*every* "*thing ought to be open, but not indifferently to every* "*man,*" reſts on a ſandy baſis; conſequently, inſtead of ſaying "*that the road to eminence and power from* "*obſcure condition ought not to be made too eaſy, nor* "*a thing too much of courſe,*" you ſhould have been inſtructed in your childhood to ſay, for you ſeem to be of an habit too irritable to bear the inſtruction with any degree of patience in your approach to ſecond childhood, that this road ought to be made as eaſy, and as much a thing of courſe, to the poor and humble, as to the rich and great.

It is very natural for a man to entertain erroneous notions of "*a due and adequate repreſentation of a* "*ſtate,*" who has no other idea of a political conſtitution than what ariſes out of "*ancient uſage* "*and precedent,*" and who derides the juſt principle of the right of the people to chuſe their own governors, and to form, or reform, a government on the baſis of the natural equal rights of men. In your zeal for the repreſentation of ability and property, and a zeal carried to an extravagant exceſs in favour of property, you overlook the only due and adequate, and indeed practicable repreſentation, univerſal and equal *perſonal* repreſentation. By the repreſentation of ability in a national legiſlative aſſembly, I ſuppoſe you mean, that the collective intellectual faculties of the people ſhould be repreſented by men of ſplendid oratorical talents. But, as in a legiſlative

legiſlative deputy, common ſenſe is a ſufficient qualification for all the beneficient purpoſes of good and wiſe legiſlation, when the legiſlative power is ſo well conſtituted and regulated, that thoſe who are entruſted with it, are ſubject to no corrupt influence to betray their importnant truſt, it is not neceſſary, that the members of ſuch an aſſembly ſhould be orators. Nay, if it ſhould ſo happen, that not a ſingle declaimer ſhould be elected into it, it would be an extraordinary circumſtance by no means to be lamented, becauſe ſuch a man often reſembles Milton's Belial, who by his ſeductive eloquence "daſhes matureſt counſels," and "makes "the worſe appear the better cauſe." But, admitting that a modern orator is actuated by the public virtue and ſpirit of a Cicero or Demoſthenes, yet at beſt he is verboſe; and men of common ſenſe may, in few words, decree in favour of a plan of obvious public utility in a twentieth part of the time which is conſumed by him in a pretty flowery long-winded harangue.—So much for your repreſentation of ability.

Your repreſentation of property I ſhall, without ceremony, treat with ſtill greater ſeverity. Property, you contend (page 75) "*never can be ſafe from the* "*invaſions of ability, unleſs it be out of all proportion,* "*predominant in the repreſentation.*" Now, to apply the very diſproportionate predominancy in the repreſentation of a ſtate, which you maintain property

ſhould

ſhould enjoy, to the caſe of the French National aſſembly, if, as according to your own ſtatement the aſſembly was, before and after the conſolidation of the three orders into one, compoſed of twelve hundred members, eleven parts in twelve of the aſſembly, which, I ſuppoſe, you will allow to be a very *proper* diſproportion, were to conſiſt of men poſſeſſed of property, "*in great maſſes of accumulation,*" what would be the conſequence? Briefly and ſimply this, "*The great maſſes,*" inſtead of "*forming,*" as you pretend, "*a natural rampart about the leſſer* "*properties in all their gradations,*" to defend them from invaſion, would be found ſo many offenſive weapons, aiming at the deſtruction of the leſſer properties. If eleven parts in twelve of the members of the National Aſſembly were men of overgrown opulence, poſſeſſing landed or monied property, agreeably to your own quaint phraſe, "*in great maſſes of accumu-* "*lation,*" they would be ſo fully occupied in what you call "*rightly protecting, and putting out of the* "*poſſibility of danger,*" their own ample poſſeſſions, that the ſecurity of the leſſer properties would not only be overlooked, but their poorer brethren ſuffer under their arrogance, inſolence, and oppreſſion. For inſtance, for one tax levied upon the *luxuries*, which might affect themſelves, they might raiſe many on the *conveniencies*, which concern men of moderate circumſtances, and ſtill more on the *neceſſaries* of life, which would bear hard on the poor, who

who form the bulk of the people in every nation. Or they might ſo modify a tax on conveniencies and neceſſaries, that men of "*leſſer properties in all their* "*gradations*, ſhall contribute in much greater proportion to the ſupply of the exigencies of government, real or imaginary (real exigencies lie in a very ſmall compaſs) than the favourite ſons and daughters of mammon. Thus, my good Sir! in carefully avoiding to ſtrike on the rock of "*a go-* "*vernment of five hundred country attornies and obſcure* "*curates, guided by a dozen of*" renegado "*perſons of* "*quality*," you, more unthinkingly, I hope, than unmercifully, would fain ſink the national ſhip of the French, containing "*twenty-four millions of men*," in the all-abſorbing vortex of a legiſlature formed of "*thoſe large proprietors, the poſſeſſors of family-* "*wealth, and of the diſtinction, which attends heredi-* "*tary poſſeſſion*," ſubjecting, with a few fine ſtrokes of your pen, the lives, liberties, and leſſer properties of a whole multitudinous people to the pleaſure and caprice of the rich and nominally great, pages 75—77. As the hearts of theſe are as often callous to every tender ſenſation, as yielding, like melted wax, to the ſoft impreſſions of benevolence; as they are as often ſhut as open to the poor man's affliction, I am unable to diſcern, that a legiſlature compoſed of the *great vulgar*, is leſs dangerous or inimical to the happineſs and liberty of a civil community, than that which might be formed of what you may perhaps contemptuouſly term the dregs of the people.

Now, by throwing "*open*" the door of repreſentation and of eligibility into the National Aſſembly "*indifferently to every man*," the evils ariſing from your favoured dominion of the rich, and from your dreaded influence of "*the body chicane*" in the French legiſlature, controuled, according to your repreſentation, in their turn, by a few degraded ariſtocrats, will be equally and effectually avoided. If the natural rights of *immediate* ſuffrage at what we ſhould call Parliamentary elections, and of a chance to be elected a member of the National Aſſembly were conceded, as they ought to be, to every man of age, pre-eminence in integrity would bear the ſway in elections, whether that pre-eminence were found among the rich, the leſs opulent, or the poor, eſpecially if a more frequent recurrence to general elections were made, by ſhortening the duration of the National Aſſembly from a *biennial* to an annual exiſtence. I may reſume and enlarge on this ſubject, in the courſe of my Examination of your Reflections.

I muſt now revert to page 75. Here you maintain that "*the characteriſtic eſſence of property is "to be unequal.*" This ſeems to me an unfounded aſſertion. One man inherits or acquires, by good or bad means, more property than another. This is no proof that property is neceſſarily, or in its own nature, unequal, or that inequality conſtitutes the characteriſtical eſſence of property. The inequality is merely an accidental or contingent circumſtance.

cumſtance. But, as the *plus* or *minus* of property is more or leſs eſteemed by you, as more or leſs qualifying a man for a ſeat in our Houſe of Commons, and conſequently in the French National Aſſembly, I ſhall contend, that inequality in point of property does not deſtroy the equality between man and man. That remains ever unchangeable in its nature; and however (at page 76) you may pertly denominate thoſe, who not only do not "*idolize*" but "*ſlight hereditary*" or acquired "*wealth and rank*, "*petulant, aſſuming, ſhort-ſighted coxcombs of philo-*"*ſophy*;" however you may labour to promote artificial diſtinctions between man and man, to give "*pre-eminence and preference to birth*," though ſoftened with the epithets "*decent and regulated*," I ſhall not heſitate to pronounce ſuch pre-eminence and preference "*unnatural, unjuſt, and impolitic*," and tending to introduce that imaginary *jure-divino* right of ariſtocratic tyranny, which, when ſuppoſedly veſted by you in a few degraded nobles in the National Aſſembly, you ſcruple not to condemn. It is my glory to give weight and conſequence to the poor man in the ſcale of civil ſociety and government, and to aſſert his natural importance as a man, by inſiſting, that he is the equal of the rich man; and to be perſonal on this intereſting ſubject, of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke. I do not deny that you are *nominally* Right Honourable as a member of the King's Privy Council. I will alſo acknowledge that you are *really* Right Honourable,

in conſequence of any public or private virtues you may poſſeſs; and far be it from me to uncharitably preſume, that they do not more than counterbalance your imperfections. My meaning is to vindicate the dignity of human nature, by avering, that the poor man is *inferior* only to him who is his *ſuperior* in honeſty and in the practice of godlineſs, and of the whole amiable train of ſocial and perſonal virtues.

"I thought you had diſmiſſed the Revolution Society with a ſufficient portion of ſarcaſm and invective. They led the *van*, but I find them appearing again more in the *centre*, and, I doubt not, as I advance in my *Examination*, I ſhall behold this harraſſed body of men bringing up the *rear* in your *hoſt* of Reflexions.—Pages 78, 79, and 80, "*The* "*gentlemen of the Revolution Society appear to be* "*ſtronlgy of opinion, that there is ſome ſcheme of politics* "*relative to this country, in which your proceedings* "*may be uſeful; for your Dr. Price cannot conclude* "*without recalling particularly to the recollection of his* "*auditory the conſideration of the favourableneſs of* "*the preſent times to all exertions in the cauſe of* "*liberty.—What is that cauſe of liberty, and what* "*are thoſe exertions in its favour, to which the example* "*of France is ſo ſingularly auſpicuous?*"—Anſwer, The cauſe of liberty in Britain, to which the example of France is auſpicious, is the very neceſſary reform of the Houſe of Commons, on the broad baſis of annual election, and of equal and univerſal repreſentation

tation and eligibility, with the exception of the dependants on the crown. "*The exertions in favour*" of this cauſe, to which the ſaid "*example is auſpicious,*" are parochial aſſociations throughout the kingdom, forming a national convention, meeting by deputation in the metropolis, as in a common centre of union, for the great and good purpoſe of accompliſhing this neceſſary reform. If the collective body of the people in this country be ſo ſunk in indolence, ſupineneſs, and indifference to their own true intereſts, as to be incapable of being rouſed by the illuſtrious example of their French neighbours to vindicate this cauſe of liberty, and to make theſe exertions in its favour, the fault lies not in the example, but in their want of will, virtue, ſenſe, and courage to follow it.

CHAPTER IX.

A full anſwer to Mr. Burke's eleven queries reſpecting the annihilation of our monarchy, laws, tribunals, and ancient corporations, geometrical and arithmetical conſtitutions, the vote of the inutility of the Houſe of Lords, the abolition of epiſcopacy, the ſale of the church lands, and the ſale of them to Jews and Jobbers.---A Jeſuit's hopes of the re-eſtabliſhment of the power and authority of the church of Rome, in England, dependant on the preſervation of civil eſtabliſhments in religion.---Aſinine reſemblance between the tribe of Iſſachar and the people of Britain.---The ſaucy French Revolutioniſts kick down the Britiſh idol they were inclined to adore.---The Engliſh nation not free while a ſingle individual is debarred of his natural rights of Parliamentary repreſentation and eligibility.---The Examiner agrees with Dr. Price, that the inequality of our repreſentation is an important imperfection in our conſtitution; but maintains that the inequality of Parliamentary eligibility, and the duration of Parliament beyond a ſingle annual ſeſſion, are defects in our conſtitution equally groſs and palpable.---Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that our repreſentation is inadequate to all the deſired purpoſes of a repreſentation.---Mr. Burke's baſtardy of the Houſe of Lords.---No difference between a government by jure-divino right, and by immutable convention.

PAGE 80 you aſk, "*Is our monarchy to be annihi-*
"*lated with all the laws, tribunals, and ancient*
"*corporations of the kingdom?*"—That cannot be annihilated which never exiſted. You here ſeem to betray your ignorance of the grand diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of a monarchy. The inveſtment

as well of the legiſlative, as of the judicial and executive powers of government in one man, ſo as to conſtitute his will the only law, and to exclude all reſponſibility reſpecting his conduct in government, are the neceſſary eſſential ingredients in the compoſition of a monarchy. An *acknowledged* monarchy, therefore, or the deſpotiſm of a *ſolus imperans*, is, God be thanked! a mere non-entity in this country. How ſtriking a reſemblance to a monarchy miniſters of the crown may introduce into our political conſtitution, by the influence which their participation of the legiſlative function in the Houſe of Commons gives them, is a point worthy of the ſerious conſideration of Britons, which to prevent, the "*auſpicious example*" of France is admirably well calculated to inſtruct them. But to term our king a monarch, or a ſole deſpot, becauſe he is inveſted with a negative in legiſlation, as well as with the ſupreme executive power, is an abuſe of words; and a *limited monarchy*, being a contradiction in terms, is *unlimited nonſenſe*.

Are "*all the laws to be annihilated?*"—No! But our voluminous complex code of law ought to be reviſed, amended, curtailed, and ſimplified, and particularly in the criminal part of our judicial proceedings; the ſeverity of capital puniſhment ought not to be extended to ſimple felony.

Are "*all the tribunals to be annihilated?*"—No! But the practice of the courts is to be amended, where amendment is judged neceſſary.

Are "*all the ancient corporations to be annihilated?*"—A corporation forms a monopoly of intereſts, and is poſſeſſed of privileges and franchiſes, from which the collective body of the people are excluded, and conſequently is deſtructive of that natural equality which ought to ſubſiſt between men. I cannot better exemplify than in the caſe of a young man, who has ſerved an apprenticeſhip to a tradeſman cloſe adjoining to the weſt-ſide of Temple-bar, precluded the benefit of excerciſing his trade on the eaſt-ſide, unleſs he conſent to purchaſe what is called his freedom of the city, as if freedom were a thing to be bought and ſold like cattle at a market. Such purchaſe and ſale are abhorrent to the very idea of liberty. On this account, with other concurrent reaſons, after ſecuring to the preſent members of corporations ſuitable penſions for life, I am an advocate for abrogating corporation charters, throwing trade open, and ſeizing the corporate lands, houſes, and revenues for the benefit of the public.

"*Is every land-mark of the country to be done away*
"*in favour of a geometrical and arithmetical conſtitu-*
"*tion?*"—*A geometrical* conſtitution is a ſoleciſm in politics. It implies the glaring abſurdity, that land, and its products, blades of graſs, and ears of corn, are capable of Parliamentary repreſentation. Property cannot be repreſented, but perſons, who poſſeſs property, more or leſs, and perſons deſtitute of property, may, and ought to be repreſented, the right to a voice in the choice of legiſlators being merely a perſonal right.

An *arithmetical* conſtitution therefore, or a conſtitution founded on the doctrine of *numbers*, comprehending the whole *number* of men of age, exerciſing their inalienable rights to Parliamentary repreſentation and eligibility, is the only wiſe, juſt, and good, political conſtitution, to the enjoyment whereof we are entitled by the unerring, impartial law of our nature as men. To eſtabliſh a political conſtitution on ſuch principles, is not to "*do* "*away*," but to reſtore, "*every land-mark of the* "*country*."

"*Is the Houſe of Lords to be voted uſeleſs ?*" — Great care muſt be taken that the Houſe of Lords confine themſelves within their own ſeparate branch of the legiſlature, and labour not to render themſelves uſeleſs, or rather miſchievous, by interfering in the election of the repreſentatives of the Commons, and influencing, in perſon or by agency, the electors in their votes. In this caſe it is a clear point, the welfare of the community is not to be ſacrificed to the partial intereſt, the ſelfiſh, ambitious views of the ariſtocracy. Such practices would tend to make the Houſe of Commons not a repreſentative of the people, inadequately and defectively as they are repreſented, but of the ariſtocratic branch of the legiſlature, and conſequently to throw the whole legiſlative power into the hands of the Lords. To obviate this poſſible miſchief, were the projected reform of the Houſe of Commons to be adopted by a national convention, I would fain recommend

recommend the meaſure of incapacitating the immediate heir to a peerage for a ſeat in the Houſe of Commons. I never could regard the eldeſt ſon of a peer, ſitting in that houſe, in any other light than as the repreſentative of his ariſtocratic father.

Moreover, this queſtion, which you have thought proper to ſtart, reſpecting the uſeleſſneſs or utility of the Houſe of Lords, involves in it other points of magnitude and importance to the welfare of the people at large, neceſſary to be inveſtigated. Now, as one queſtion is fairly anſwered by another, I interrogate, if it be poſſible in the preſent ſtate of Parliamentary election and repreſentation, for a peer to influence a borough election, ſo as that it ſhall terminate in favour of one of his dependants, who may privately covenant with the peer to reſign his ſeat in Parliament in behalf of his heir, as ſoon as he arrives at the year of maturity, whether this influence ought to be adduced as a proof of the utility of the Houſe of Lords?

I would alſo aſk any other man but Mr. Burke, and men like him, who are profeſſed partial advocates for the ariſtocracy, if it be true that certain peers of the realm polled at the late general election of commoners, whether they be entitled by the conſtitution, *as it now ſtands*, to a ſhare in ſuch election? and, if the queſtion be reſolved in the affirmative, whether the conſtitution ought not to undergo a reform in this inſtance, and the peers to be reduced to this alternative, either to confine themſelves to

their

their own branch of the legiſlature, or at once to ſtrip themſelves of the privileges of the peerage, and deſcend to the *humble* condition of commoners? Were I a peer of the realm, I ſhould not thank Mr. Burke for the officious obtruſion of his queſtion reſpecting the inutility of my noble order on the public.

"*Is epiſcopacy to be aboliſhed?*"—If the people at large, or their governors, judge the abolition of dioceſan epiſcopacy to be conducive to public utility, they will of courſe aboliſh it. For, if the one, or the other, or both, can perſuade themſelves into an opinion, that they do not invade God's prerogative in forming a civil eſtabliſhment in religion, and that it is not neceſſary to produce a commiſſion from God, or from his meſſenger Chriſt, for that purpoſe, they, who think themſelves competent to eſtabliſh dioceſan epiſcopacy, can certainly regard themſelves as inveſted with a power to aboliſh it at their pleaſure. The hierarchy, or bench of ſpiritual lords, in this country, cannot but acknowledge their *everlaſting obligations* to Mr. Burke for the propoſal of this queſtion.

"*Are the church lands to be ſold?*"—The anſwer which was given to the former queſtion concerning dioceſan epiſcopacy, applies to this. If the people, or their governors, may take away from the clergy thoſe lands, which in an age and with a zeal of what may be thought erroneous ignorant piety, they gave them, and provide for their ſupport in a manner, which may be deemed more conſiſtent with national

utility,

utility, the ſame authority is certainly competent to the ſale of theſe lands.

But are they "*to be ſold to Jews?*"—Were the naturalization of the Jews to take place, a meaſure which (though reaſonable in itſelf, it being unjuſt to exclude any ſet of men from an equal enjoyment of political rights on the ſcore of religion) was moſt vehemently, and too ſucceſsfully oppoſed in the enlightened adminiſtration of Mr. Pelham; were this meaſure to be revived and carried into effect, certainly Jews would be alike entitled with Chriſtians to bid for theſe lands at a public vendue; and agreeably to an eſtabliſhed condition of ſale at an auction, if the higheſt bidders, to become the purchaſers.

But "*are the church lands to be ſold to jobbers?*"—If theſe lands were to be knocked down by the hammer of Mr. Chriſtie, or any other faſhionable auctioneer in the employ of government, indiſcriminately to naturalized Jews and Chriſtians; and if thoſe Jews or Chriſtians bought them with a view to a lucrative job by ſelling them again, they would of courſe be ſold to jobbers. But, in the caſe of the ſeizure of church lands in this country, an event which your queſtion, though contrary to your deſign in framing it, tends more to haſten than to retard, I would not recommend the ſale of them in any ſhape. I think it more adviſable they ſhould be depoſited and retained in the hands of a reformed legiſlature, as an ample ſource of public revenue;

to

to be lett to advantage on ſhort leaſes, and the rents from time to time applied as ways and means to ſupport the real exigencies of government, not the fictitious wants of a multitudinous hoſt of unneceſſary civil officers, placemen, and penſioners. This retention and diſpoſal of the church lands, and application of their rents, would ſuperſede the imaginary neceſſity of the preſent enormous accumulation of oppreſſive taxes. You, in your high-flying religious zeal, a zeal not according to ſound knowledge, angrily condemn the confiſcation and ſale of the lands of the Gallican church as a *ſacrilege*. Your Examiner chuſes to expreſs it by the milder, ſofter, and more ſimple term of a *reſumption*, and a *juſt* reſumption; eſpecially as their civil governors guarantee the ſupport of the ſecular clergy of the eſtabliſhent, by the ſubſtitution of a leſs exceptionable mode of proviſion. Now, waving the queſtion about the *natural* or *revealed* lawfulneſs or unlawfulneſs of political conſtitutions in religion, this is an axiom, a ſelf-evident truth, that, if a ſtate will have an eſtabliſhed clergy, more of public liberality equally diſpenſed, than of parſimony, ought to appear in the maintenance of that clergy.

I cannot yet diſmiſs theſe your two queſtions repecting the abolition of dioceſan epiſcopacy and the ſale of church lands, without giving you to underſtand that, if in my adoleſcence I had been educated in the ſubtle ſchool of St. Ignatius, and conſequently my young mind had been deeply tinctured with its

pernicious

pernicious leſſons of eaſy, convenient, pliant morality, and the whole of my religion reſolved into an ardent zeal, craftily directed for the ſupport of the wealth and authority of the church of Rome, I ſhould have been tempted to declare my anxious apprehenſions for the cauſe of epiſcopacy, and for the ſafety of the church lands in England. And why? becauſe, if the "*auſpicious example*" of France, in the buſineſs of church-reformation, ſhould extend to England, and, agreeably to the cuſtomary practice of Engliſh *improvement* upon French *invention*, be puſhed forward to an entire overthrow of the eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, my hopes of future ſucceſs in the re-eſtabliſhment of a Popiſh on the ruins of a Proteſtant hierarchy would be completely fruſtrated; for, where there is no civil eſtabliſhment in religion, there can be no reinſtatement of the power and authority of the church of Rome. The downfall of the latter proceeds in a ratio exactly correſpondent to the non-exiſtence of the former; and, when unarmed with the civil power, ſhe loſes her ferocious talons as a bird of prey, and becomes harmleſs as a dove.

Your remaining queſtions propoſed in pages 80 and 81, ſavor ſo much of rhodomontade-inſipidity, worſe than puerile, for it would diſgrace a claſſical ſchool boy, that I ſhould derogate from my dignity as a man, were I to condeſcend to beſtow on them a ſerious anſwer.

"*We*" Britons "*are ſuppoſed*" by the French "*a dull ſluggiſh race.*" Fond as you are of "nick-

naming

naming God's creatures," you might have ventured to improve your ſuppoſition into dull ſluggiſh *aſſes*. The epithets dull and ſluggiſh would have equally befitted thoſe long-eared animals; and it is poſſible ſome ſtriking trait of reſemblance may exiſt between us as rational and them as ſenſitive creatures. As you are well read in the ſcriptures of the old covenant, I ſhall bring to your recollection the patriarch Jacob's prophetic deſcription of the tribe of his ſon Iſſachar, Gen. xlix. 14, 15, "Iſſachar is a ſtrong aſs, "couching down between two burthens, and bowed "his ſhoulder to bear, and become a ſervant unto "tribute." *We* are exactly in a ſimilar predicament with the wretched aſs Iſſachar. *We* bow our ſhoulders to bear, and became ſervants to tribute, bending under the oppreſſive weight of heavily laden panniers of infinitely-multiplied taxation, levied to pay the intereſt of near three hundred millions of national debt, incurred for the ſupport of civil eſtabliſhments in time of peace, partly needleſs, and partly unneceſſarily enlarged, with the additional enrichment of loan-jobbers and army and navy contractors in time of war. War! that *dreadful error* of governments, which leads our brave ſoldiers and ſailors like ſheep to the ſlaughter; and, to purſue the figure, *fleeces* the people at large, *cloſe ſhorn* of their property. This tame abject ſubmiſſion of our necks to the yoke you miſconſtrue into an opinion of our being "*rendered paſſive by find-*"*ing our ſituation tolerable*," when it might be more

rightly

rightly interpreted a ſervile deſpondency, and dejection of ſpirits, occaſioned by this intolerable bondage, incapacitating the human mind for proper active exertions to obtain a happy deliverance from it. We are ſo far "*from ever attaining*" the "*full* "*perfection of freedom*," that there is danger of its "*mediocrity*" inſenſibly dwindling, if not rapidly declining, into nought of freedom but the name. I never could reflect, without indignation, on the idea of the neceſſity of an annual ſum of ſeventeen millions to defray the current expences of the year.

"*Your leaders in France began by affecting to ad-*
"*mire, almoſt to adore, the Britiſh conſtitution; but, as*
"*they advanced, they came to look upon it with a*
"*ſovereign contempt.*" There is ſomething ſo dazzling in the Britiſh conſtitution at the firſt tranſient view of it, that the eyes of the leaders of the French Revolution might be blinded with the glare, accuſtomed as they had long been to grope in the dark cells of ſlavery. They might therefore, without affectation, admire our conſtitution; but, ſoon familiarized to the light of truth and liberty, they found, on a cloſer inſpection, its original purity and ſimplcity ſo effaced and loſt in the corruptions foiſted into it, that they quickly changed their opinion of our conſtitution for one leſs favourable but more juſt, and with contempt kicked down the idol they were before inclined, according to your repreſentation, to *adore*.

Page 82, "*The Revolution Society has diſcovered*
"*that the Engliſh nation is not free.*" It certainly does

does not enjoy freedom "*in its full perfection,*" while any one man, arrived at years of maturity, is debarred the exercise of his natural right to vote in the election of representatives. So well founded on truth is Dr. Price's remark, in his "Discourse on the Love of our Country," 3d edit. p. 39, that an "important instance of the imperfect state, in which "the Revolution left our constitution, is the *in-*"*equality of our representation.*" This staunch old friend to the rights of man calls it indeed "the most "important instance." It is indeed one of the most important instances, but I regard *the inequality of Parliamentary eligibility* as an instance equally important, as also that other instance of imperfection, or rather violation of the constitution, which was introduced in a few years after the Revolution, by an act of the sixth of William and Mary, extending the duration of Parliaments from one year to three years; and still farther prolonged to a septennial existence in the first of George the first. The first was an invasion, and an unconstitutional usurpation of the right of the constituent by the representative body; but the last, the septennial act, constituted a most gross and daring infringement. However, I perfectly agree with the Doctor, that notwithstanding your insinuation to the contrary, this one defect alone, "the inequality of our representation is a "defect in our constitution, so *gross* and so *palpable*, "as to make it excellent chiefly in *form* and *theory*; "that a representation," I will add an equal and

univerſal repreſentation, " in the legiſlature of a " kingdom, is the *baſis* of conſtitutional liberty in " it, and of all legitimate government; that without " it a government is nothing but an uſurpation; " that the inadequateneſs of our repreſentation is " our fundamental grievance, that when the repre- " ſentation is partial, a kingdom poſſeſſes liberty " only partially; and if extremely partial, it gives " only a *ſemblance* of liberty; but, if not only " extremely partial, but corruptly choſen, and under " corrupt influence after being choſen, it becomes " a *nuiſance*, and produces the worſt of all forms " of government, a government by corruption, " a government carried on and ſupported by " ſpreading venality and profligacy through a king- " dom."

I have here given a fair and full extract from the Doctor's Diſcourſe, (pages 39—41,) free from thoſe not very ingenuous mutilations, which it has experienced from the pen of Mr. Burke in page 82. The Doctor applies his juſt and ſenſible remarks to the caſe of *a* kingdom or kingdoms in general, and not to that of *the* kingdom, or our kingdom in particular. The change of particles *a* for *the* is an unfair advantage taken of the man of letters by the man of the world.

When the repreſentation of the people, inſtead of being enlarged to univerſality, as it ought to be, has been unconſtitutionally narrowed by the arbitrary diſfranchiſing ſtatute of the eighth of Henry the

ſixth

ſixth; when miniſters, inſtead of being confined to their executive province under the crown, not only partake of, but can, by their influence, nearly engroſs the legiſlative power in the Houſe of Commons; when the members of that Houſe, inſtead of ſinking, agreeably to the firſt principles of the conſtitution, into the maſs of the people, at the end of a ſingle annual ſeſſion, poſſeſs, as it were, a leaſehold of their ſeats for ſeven years, and conſequently are ſtrongly tempted to become the mercenaries of adminiſtration, it is an inſult on the tame patience of the people to repreſent, in page 83, our conſtitution, "*as it now* "*ſtands, an old faſhioned conſtitution, under which we* "*have long proſpered.*" It is a *new-fangled* conſtitution, of which, not proſperity is the bright, but adverſity is the gloomy characteriſtic, and an adverſity haſtening with rapid ſtrides to the laſt extremity, with this only dawn of hope and gleam of comfort left, that, according to the old adage, "when things "are at the worſt they will mend." That the people have not already felt this dreadful extremity, ſeems owing, under God, to their aſtoniſhing, and almoſt incredible active exertions as agriculturiſts, manufacturers, and merchants; who may not unaptly be compared to ſwarms of induſtrious bees, ſucking honey from every flower, for the purpoſe of being plundered of a conſiderable portion of their ſtock to feed and pamper neſts of idle drones, and deſtructive hornets.

"*Our repreſentation,*" you ſay, "*has been found* "*perfectly adequate to all the purpoſes, for which a* "*repreſentation of the people can be deſired or devi-* "*ſed.*" Now all the purpoſes, which can be anſwered by a repreſentation of the people, may be ſummed up in theſe few words, the *ſecurity of their lives, liberties, and properties,* on contributing a neceſſary portion of the latter, to the neceſſary ſupport of government, which is inſtituted, not for deſtruction, but for the protection, of the ſaid valuable rights. And this would infallibly be our happy ſituation, were our Houſe of Commons purged of miniſters of the crown, and annually elected by the free, fair, full voice of the reſt of the people at large, from among themſelves, in their reſpective equaliſed diſtricts. But to denominate that a repreſentation of the people, eſpecially in its preſent very partial and defective ſtate, which, in conſequence of the parliamentary eligibility of the miniſters of and dependants on the crown, and of the poſſibility of an united irreſiſtible influence of the treaſury, and of the ariſtocracy, over the conſtituent and repreſentative bodies, may prove to be very little more than a repreſentation of theſe two powerful parties, is, to apply your own words, at page 84, a mere mockery of the people, and unpardonable ſubſtitution of the "*ſhadow*" for the ſubſtance. How ſuch a repreſentation can be found perfectly "*adequate to all the* "*purpoſes*" of a popular repreſentation, and whether it may not be more adequate to the roguiſh purpoſe

of

of legiſlating for the enrichment and aggrandizement of the few, to the impoveriſhment and debaſement of the many, are queſtions of which the reſolution I ſubmit to the common judgement and feelings of every unbiaſſed individual.

In your extraordinary aſſertion (but what is there which iſſues from your pericranium which is not extraordinary?)" *if popular repreſentation, or choice, is* " *neceſſary to the legitimacy of all government, the Houſe of* " *Lords is baſtardized,*" &c. your zeal for the cauſe of the ariſtocracy burns itſelf. A determined enemy to the Houſe of Lords, who ſought its downfall, would adopt the very ſame ſly inſinuation to convey to the people his ideas of its being a mere unneceſſary excreſcence in our political conſtitution. The friends of the people, both as private individuals, and as members of the Conſtitutional and Revolution Societies, who participate of the ſuperlative honour of being very wiſely ſelected by you as butts for the exerciſe of your ſhafts of raillery and irony, ſeek to perſuade the people to unite for the purpoſe of reforming their own legiſlative aſſembly, the Houſe of Commons, on the principle, as well of conſtitutional as of national right, and particularly in the very neceſſary important points of parliamentary repreſentation, being convinced, that " *popular repreſentation, or* " *choice, is neceſſary to the legitimacy of all government.*" If you chuſe to infer from the neceſſity of ſuch legitimacy, that " *the Houſe of Lords is baſtar-* " *dized,*" I ſhall not be ſo unpolite as to moleſt you

in the poſſeſſion and enjoyment of this very ſagacious inference, which involves that branch of the legiſlature in an everlaſting debt of gratitude to Mr. Burke. Inſolvent as the Houſe muſt conſequently be, there is however one mode of teſtifying a ſenſe of their obligations to their generous benefactor, which probably they will not heſitate to adopt, namely, to join unanimouſly in a ſupplicatory addreſs to the King, praying, that his Majeſty would be graciouſly pleaſed, in conſideration of your ſingular merits as a friend to the Peerage, to extend to Mr. Burke the privilege of taking precedence at court of the whole Houſe of Peers. That the addreſs may be honoured in a manner ſuitable to the importance of the occaſion, let it be preſented by a deputation of ſeven Peers, conſiſting of the firſt in rank, the Primate of *all* England, the Lord High Chancellor, and the Premier-Duke, Marquis, Earl, Viſcount, and Baron.

The waſpiſhneſs and teſtineſs diſcernable in pages 85 and 86, I ſhall paſs unnoticed, together with the forced pedantic alluſion and compariſon or two, which accompany them, and refer you for my ſentiments on the "*alliance between church and ſtate,*" to what I have before ſaid on the ſubject of civil eſtabliſhments in religion.

Page 86, "*As to the ſhare of power, authority,* "*and direction, which each individual ought to have* "*in the management of the ſtate, that I muſt deny*

"*to*

" *to be amongſt the direct original rights of man in* " *civil ſociety.*"

For your " *that I muſt deny,*" I muſt take leave to ſubſtitute my *that I muſt affirm*, and to ſpecify the ſhare of power, &c. which each individual ought to poſſeſs in the management of a ſtate, as his direct original right. Firſt then, all men, who have attained the year of legal maturity, if not before, have an impreſcriptible right to a ſhare in the legiſlative repreſentation, to a voice in the choice of legiſlators. Secondly, they have a right to a ſhare in the legiſlative eligibility, to a chance to be elected a legiſlator. Thirdly, they have a right to a frequent recurrence to the exerciſe of theſe direct original rights, of which for the people to ſuffer themſelves to be deprived for a longer term than a year, is no great proof of the national wiſdom. Fourthly, without waiting for the annual expiration of the legiſlative function, they have a direct original right to a ſhare of direction in the management of a ſtate, by an interference of their authority in the way of remonſtrance, at any time when they perceive their legiſlative deputies are more intent on providing for their own private emolument, than for public welfare; and, if their remonſtrances be diſregarded, to take more effectual meaſures for remedying this abuſe of power, even to the *caſhierment* of their deputies, if neceſſary. Theſe are " *amongſt the direct* " *original rights of man in civil ſociety,*" and not " *a* " *thing to be ſettled,*" as you maintain, " *by convention.*" It is altogether independent on convention; and ſo

far

far is "*civil ſociety*" from being "*the offſpring of* "*convention*," that as ſoon as it is diſcovered by the people that they have entered into a convention or compact with their governors, which bears hard upon theſe their natural and direct original rights, they have a right to diſſolve this convention, and to frame a new form of government, if they find the old form too bad to be reformed, ſo as to be made capable of anſwering the end of all government, the protection of natural property, liberty, and happineſs. "*Againſt theſe the rights of men, there* "*can be no preſcription, againſt theſe no agreement is* "*binding*;" though you ironically inſinuate to the contrary. But, that you may not urge me into a diſguſting repetition of my former remarks on the nature, origin, and end of government, let it ſuffice to ſay, that the diſtinction, which you labor to eſtabliſh between the old exploded doctrine, a government by ſlaviſh *jure-divino* indefeaſible right, and your new broached tenet of a government by immutable convention, is a diſtinction without a difference. In both, the ſame debaſing principles of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance predominate. Nay, as your fair and candid critics, the author of the Monthly Review (honeſt men, who are not to be intimidated by the celebrity of your name from giving their unbiaſſed ſentiments of your work) remark, "the ground of *ancient uſage* is full as dangerous as "that of "*divine right*." It is as dangerous, becauſe the man, who adopts it, virtually declares, that we

"could

" could have no right to liberty, unleſs our fore-fathers had enjoyed it before us:" and artfully inculcates an implicit veneration for a political conſtitution, which, through the intrigues of a long ſucceſſion of deſigning ſtateſmen, ever partial to the tyrannous ſpirit of Norman fealty, is over-run with defects, abuſes, and corruptions.

CHAPTER X.

A man, when he enters into civil ſociety, does not, as Mr. Burke contends, to ſecure ſome liberty, ſurrender the whole of it.—Citation from the Monthly Review for November, 1790.—Mr. Burke's aſſertion, that ſimple governments are fundamentally defective, founded in error.——Mr. Burke's fanciful invention, that the rights of man are in a ſort of middle, expoſed.—The error of Mr. Burke in aſſerting, that the rights of men in governments are their advantages.—Two hihgly finiſhed drawings, caricatures, the one by Mr. Burke of an horrid ſpectacle on the beau jour, October the 6th, 1789; the other by Monſ. Lally Tollendahl de la caverne des Antropophages.—The humanity of the decrees of the National Aſſembly in favour of the equal rights of men gives the untruth direct to Tollendahl's drawing.—Mr. Burke's tragedy-piece unfaithful in two inſtances.—Freſh inſtances of Mr. Burke's LIBERAL *treatment of the Revolution Society and Dr. Price.—Inconſiſtency in the ſorrowful ſenſibility of a certain Britiſh ſenator.—The confinement of the French king and queen excites different ſenſations in Mr. Burke and the Examiner.—The Examiner furniſhes the National Aſſemby with hints of a decree for the prevention of riots.—Mr. Burke's* SUICIDAL *joy.—A tragic ſketch of the French queen and her maids of honour in the future act of ſuicide.—The Examiner adviſes her againſt it.*

IN page 88, you produce a man's ſuſpenſion of the exerciſe of his natural right "*to be his own* "*governor*," to "*be judge in his own cauſe*," to defend himſelf in caſes, where civil ſociety provides more

more effectually for his defence, as an inſtance that man, to "*ſecure ſome liberty, makes a ſurrender in* "*truſt of the whole of it.*" Now, unhappily for you, the very reverſe is the truth;—for, in a ſtate of uncivilized nature, a ſtronger man than he might overcome him, and deprive him of his life and liberty; conſequently by his ſuſpenſion of his right of ſelf-defence in theſe caſes, in virtue of his uniting himſelf to civil ſociety, *he ſurrenders a ſmall portion of his liberty, that he may ſecure the whole of it.*

What follows (pages 88, 89) reſpecting your aſſertion, that "*the want of a ſufficient reſtraint on* "*their paſſions is to be reckoned among human wants* "*to be provided for by government;*" that "*this can* "*only be done by a power out of themſelves;*" and that "*the reſtraints on men, as well as their liberties, are* "*to be reckoned among their rights,*" is ſo ably controverted, and completely expoſed, by the authors of the Monthly Review for November, 1790, page 321, and as well in a vein of humour, as with the force of truth, that I cannot reſiſt the temptation of gratifying my readers with a fair citation of the whole paſſage.—"Thus, for inſtance, when a mi-"niſter of ſtate ſees any man ſuch a ſlave of paſſion, "as to find fault with him, with his favourite, or "with his miſtreſs, he knows directly that he *wants* "to be ſhut up in the *Baſtille.* Accordingly, to "indulge the poor man in the exerciſe of his un-"doubted privileges, he conducts him thither, by "means of a ſhort, but comprehenſive *bill of rights,*

called

" called a *letter de cachet:* which perhaps, if the mi-
" niſter is ſo conſiderate as to enquire into the full
" extent of the good man's *wants*, and ſo humane
" as to allow him the plenary enjoyment of his
" *rights*, he kindly converts into an *act of ſettlement*
" for life."

I never peruſed a work ſo abounding in aſſertion, and ſo defective in argument, as theſe your celebrated Reflexions. But your admires, captivated with the pompous diſplay of your imagery, with the gorgeous dreſs of your diction, overlook and contemn with yourſelf thoſe humble, plain, uſeful things, common ſenſe and ſound reaſoning.

Page 91, " *The ſimple governments are fundamentally*
" *defective.*" Here again an aſſertion, unſupported by proof, is obtruded on the public. Do you diſclaim a regard to rectitude and virtue in the formation of a government? or rather have you perſuaded yourſelf into a belief, that political morality is a non-entity? If ſo, is this the conſequence of ſome lamentable defect in your education? I can only ſay, that, if I had been ſo happy as to have received the firſt rudiments of my education under a plain virtuous Quaker, I think no one good and wiſe man would have judged it well-finiſhed, at leaſt in the moſt eſſential point, the improvement of my morals, in a ſeminary of ſubtle double-dealing Jeſuits. They might indeed qualify me, by their leſſons of refined intrigue, and of claſſical, but Belial-like, oratory, to ſhine as a man of the world in a ſenate, or in a court; and to conform with

Proteus-

Proteus-like adroitneſs, to the various ſhuffling manœuvres which characteriſe the deſignedly complex, crooked, wretched, wicked ſyſtem of policy, which too often prevails in both.—"Omnis Ariſtippum decuit color, et ſtatus, et res." But theſe inſtructors muſt ever incapacitate me for diſcerning, or reliſhing the beauty and excellence of a "*ſimple government*," with political morality for its baſis, or, in other words, founded on a ſcrupulous attention to the equal rights of men; in ſhort, on the natural and Chriſtian principles of univerſal equity, benevolence, and liberty. Is ſuch a government, where every man, though not a legiſlator, has a voice in the choice of legiſlators, and is equally eligible as ſuch; is ſuch a government, where the important truſt of legiſlation for the welfare of millions is not delegated to any ſet of men for a longer term than a year, and for a ſhorter period, if found neceſſary to the ſupport of that axiom in politics, "Salus populi ſuprema "lex;" is ſuch a government, where the legiſlatory, the judicatory, and executory powers are wiſely ſeparated, and veſted in the hands of different individuals, the averſion of our king's privy counſellor? *Affirming* in words, but not *confirming* by argument, that "*no* "*ſimple diſpoſition or direction of power can be ſuitable* "*either to man's nature, or to the quality of his affairs*," he is an advocate for "*the greateſt poſſible complexity* "*of contrivance in a political conſtitution.*" Is not this, in plainer words, to declare, that it is perfectly agreeable to your political principles, that, rulers being

being not made for the people, but the people for their rulers, to be fleeced at all times, and in times of war ſlaughtered, the ſcience and practice of government ſhould be induſtriouſly involved in a miſt of artificial confuſion, in an affected obſcurity, in a convenient labyrinth of myſtery, by huddling and jumbling together the legiſlatory, judicatory, and executory powers in the perſons of the miniſters of the crown, leſt the people ſhould open their eyes to a ſight of their true intereſt, and unite for the purpoſe of reforming the Houſe of Commons on a large ſcale, on a broad liberal baſis? It is folly in the extreme to boaſt of the excellency of a nominal tripartite conſtitution of King, Lords, and Commons, when the miniſters of the firſt, and when the ſecond can, in perſon or by agencies, ſo influence Parliamentary elections of ſeptennial duration, in the preſent very inadequate and defective ſtate of repreſentation and eligibility, as that a very large majority of the members of the Houſe ſhall be compoſed of miniſters and their dependants, and of heirs to peerages, or of men otherwiſe devoted to the intereſt of the peers. Nominal repreſentatives of a handful of venal electors, they may become real repreſentatives of adminiſtration, and of the ariſtocracy.

But to blind the people ſtill more, and to keep them faſt bound in ignorance, well calculated is your fanciful invention, page 92, that "*the rights of men* "*are in a ſort of middle, incapable of definition, but not* "*impoſſible to be diſcerned.*" It is not difficult to diſcern

diſcern that your beloved ariſtocracy is ſituated in a kind of *middle* between monarchy and democracy, and therefore this your curious middle is capable of definition. But the "Eſt modus in rebus; ſunt "certi denique fines, quos ultra citraque nequit "conſiſtere rectum;" the "medio tutiſſimus ibis;" the golden mean, is not applicable here. We all know, that the virtues lie in a mean or medium between the two extremes of their oppoſite vices. Exempli gratia, œconomy is equi-diſtant from parſimony on the one hand, and from prodigality on the other; and, not to produce other inſtances, true rational religion holds her ſober temperate ſway, alike removed from the enthuſiaſtic tyranny of credulity and ſuperſtition, and from the gloomy iron-reign of the apathy of Atheiſm.

But I think it would require the exertion of your ſophiſtry, in its full extent, to delude the people into an opinion, that this middle ſpecies of government, the domination of an ariſtocracy, is a political evil of leſs magnitude and miſchief than the tyranny of a monarchy or the deſpotiſm of an ochlocracy. It is in fact, of the three evils the worſt; for there is uſually an inſolence ſo overbearing, an hauteur ſo diſguſting in the deportment of the nobles towards the people at large, their nominal inferiors, but real equals, that the nation, which is ſubjugated to their rule, is likely to groan under a ſtate of vaſſalage in the extreme. "*The rights of men*" therefore "*are*" ſo far from lying "*in*" this "*ſort of middle*," that

that they are in danger of being abſorbed in it. You may indeed pleaſe yourſelf, and teize the public, with holding forth the plauſible idea, that the power of the Lords in this country is neceſſary to eſtabliſh a kind of fanciful equilibrium between the rights of the people and the prerogatives of the crown, and to keep down the aſpiring thoughs and machinations of ambition in both. But a moment's reflexion on the dangerous influence which the Lords poſſeſs in elections of the Commons' Houſe of Parliament, in conſequence of what is called their Borough-Intereſt, is ſufficient to convince all but their own dependants, that, without a radical reform of the Houſe of Commons, the apprehenſions that the rights of the people and the juſt prerogatives of the crown, which are the gift of the people, may be ſacrificed to the all-graſping ambition of this "*ſort* "*of middle*," are not merely viſionary. But why do I ſpeak of the rights of the people to a gentleman, who aſſerts, "*the rights of men in governments are* "*their advantages?*" That is, in plain Engliſh, ſtripped of the low cunning, and ſtudied confuſion of an equivocating *middle*, the opulent and mighty Lord poſſeſſes the *advantage* of an extenſive borough-intereſt in Parliamentary elections, and this *advantage* is his *right*. On this moſt curious principle you found and vindicate his title to ſo dangerous a right over the poor people. Now, to wave the point, that influence of every kind, exerted as well by a Commoner as by a Lord, their election

of

of the repreſentatives of the people is not leſs illegal than unconſtitutional, it cannot be a matter of doubt, that, as the Lord is a member of a ſeparate branch of the legiſlature, this *advantage* from influence is *not* his *right*; and the Lord, who claims it and exerciſes it, ought at once to be *hurled* from the Peerage.

Page 93, I paſs by, without comment or remark, your brilliant ſcintillations of wit reſpecting the ſelf-ſought volcanic fate of Empedocles, and "*his* "*brazen ſlippers.*" I give you full credit, that you "*never liked this continual talk of reſiſtence and revo-* "*lution,*" and "*diſtemper of remedy,*" in ſtate-maladies. I leave your "*doſes of mercury ſublimate*" to diſeaſed debauchees, and your "*provocatives of* "*cantharides*" to worn out rakes. Page 94. I treat with the ſilence of contempt your illiberal reflexions on "*eager politicians out of parliament,*" whoſe principles, by the bye, it is eaſy to perceive you as much dread coming into faſhion, as you affect to deſpiſe. Page 97.—I laugh at the oddity of the comic parallel you draw between the principles and conduct of "*Dr. Price and Hugh Peters*;" and rejoice with the Doctor that "I have lived to ſee thirty millions of "people demanding liberty with an irreſiſtible voice, "*their king led in triumph, and an arbitrary monarch* "*ſurrendering himſelf to his ſubjects.*" As happily the French did not follow the example of Britons in an age leſs diſtinguiſhed for humanity than the preſent, by proceeding to the decapitation of their king,

the triumphal proceſſion ſerves as an excellent memento to kings in general, to conſider themſelves not as the *proprietors*, but as the *protectors*, of the people, from whom, under God, they derive their executive power of government. Page 99, I cannot agree with you, that the Doctor's application of "*the beautiful and prophetic ejaculation*" of "*Nunc-*"*dimittis*," to this "*eventful period*," is a "*profaning*" of it. It ſhould rather be termed a *conſecration* of it; a ſolemn word, which in ſome parts of your work you are ready enough to apply, when you think it will anſwer your purpoſe. For what occaſion could more properly and deſervedly excite the good old preacher's joy and gratitude to God, than a permiſſion to live to behold a reſolute vindication of the rights of men in France, triumphing over the cruſhing tripartite oppreſſion of hierarchic, ariſtocratic, and monarchic deſpotiſm?

Pages 101, 102, Unworthy of notice is your repreſentation, or rather miſrepreſentation, of the National Aſſembly, as ſubjugated to the over-ruling influence of "*clubs compoſed of a monſtrous medley of all*"*conditions, tongues, and nations*," of "*academies in-*"*tended as ſo many ſeminaries for theſe clubs of a mixt*"*mob of ferocious men, and of women loſt to ſhame.*" I ſhall paſs on to your highly-finiſhed drawing "*of the*"*moſt atrocious and afflicting ſpectacle*" exhibited "*on the morning*" of the "*beau jour*," the "*beauti-*"*ful day the ſixth of October*, 1789." Pages 99--110. It is not a mere ſketch. It is a finiſhed chef d'œuvre from

from the hand of a maſter. It abounds with the ſpirited ſtrokes of a Michael Agnolo, blended with the ſombre-traits of a Salvator Roſa.

It is my particular requeſt to the ingenious artiſts of the pallet of the Royal Academy, that they would ſelect ſome one academician or aſſociate from their body, whoſe bruſh they think qualified to do juſtice to your pen, to treat the public at a future exhibition with the ſight of a picture, ſtrongly coloured, from your original drawing. As a ſuitable companion to it, may be ſuſpended in their Great Room another painting, taken from that other capital drawing by Monſieur de Lally Tollendahl, "la caverne des "Antropophages," or men-eaters, to which he very politely compares the National Aſſembly.

The two pieces are excellent in their kind, and lay claim to ſuperior merit. There is indeed one *triſle* of a fault common to both; and, influenced by the candour of criticiſm, which diſtinguiſhes the good natured Horace, I feel myſelf inclined to conceal it from public view.

"Aſt, ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis
"Offendar maculis; quas aut incuria fudit,
"Aut humana parum cavit natura;
"Nec pulchro in corpore nævos
"Reprendam."

It ſeems invidious to mention it, and, in the opinion of ſome, may argue a diſpoſition to captious cavil.

But my love of truth overcomes all inferior conſiderations, and irreſiſtibly impels me to declare, that theſe capital pieces of the imagination are defective

in a ſtrict adherence to this cardinal virtue. They are not free from exaggeration and miſrepreſentation. They are heightened, overcharged, caricatured. The general tenor of the decrees of the National Aſſembly, founded on that regard to the natural equal rights of men, which they obſerved in the formation of their new free conſtitution, directly militates againſt the aſperſions thrown on the general character and conduct of its members. Theſe ſpeak moſt forcibly in their favour, and give the untruth direct to unmanly and illiberal invectives. Theſe exhibit active patriotiſm and philanthropy very foreign to the odious character of Anthropophagi. The conſtitutive National Aſſembly ſincerely lamented, and exerted themſelves to the utmoſt, though in vain, to prevent the horrid ſpectacle, and the outrageous indignities offered to their King and Queen. Your deſcription of the tragedy ſcene itſelf, well-wrought up as it is, ſavours of the outrè. Your "*great hiſtory-piece of the maſſacre of inno-*" *cents*" is extravagantly carried beyond the line of truth. It is unfaithful in two particulars. The author of "Short Obſervations on the Right Hon. Edmund Burke's Reflections" (I take my account from the review of the Pamphlet in the Monthly Review for January, 1791, Page 94) ſays, that "the "inſurgents never entered the Queen's chamber; "and that the gallant colonel, Monſieur Miomandre, whoſe death Mr. Burke ſo pathetically de-"ſcribes, is alive and well, we are told, in London."

Page

Page 102, Your ill-natured ſuppoſition, that the tranſaction of the "*beau jour*" met "*the applauſes of* "*the Revolution Society,*" and afforded matter of triumph to Doctor Price, mark you only as a proper ſubject for the contempt and deriſion of that reſpectable body, and of their worthy preacher. To detract from the intrinſic merit of the latter, and to leſſen him in the eſtimation of all wiſe and good men, is a point which can never be accompliſhed by the bombaſt rant of a frothy declaimer.

Page 111, "*Influenced by the inborn feelings of my* "*nature, I confeſs, that the exalted rank of the perſons* "*ſuffering, and particularly the ſex, the beauty, and* "*the amiable qualities of the deſcendant of ſo many* "*kings and emperors, with the tender age of royal* "*infants, add not a little to my ſenſibility on that* "*moſt melancholy occaſion.*" To wave a ſcrutiny into the ſtrict propriety of the expreſſion, "*inborn feel-* "*ings of my nature,*" I ſhall content myſelf with obſerving, that poſſibly, in the language of Job, your "eyes were a fountain of tears, which wept day and night", for "*the cruel outrages, to which* "*the royal ſufferers were expoſed.*" But why are the flood gates of your eyes to be opened—why is the grand reſervoir of your tears to be kept for them alone? "Why," to adopt the expreſſions reported to have been uſed by a *certain orator* in a *certain great aſſembly*, on the ſubject of a *certain trial*, "is not pity to be extended to the unfortunate "ſufferers" in the Baſtile, "as well as to the

" king and queen of the French? Why is the " extent, the length, and the magnitude of their " oppreſſions to be unnumbered without a ſigh, " while ſo much feeling was expreſſed for the ſuf- " ferings of the authors of ſuch ſufferings?" Why, becauſe, according to your mode of reaſoning, the rights of crowned heads are their " *advantages*," and the rights of the people are their *ſufferings*, and the ſufferings of incarceration, without hope of redemption, and perhaps terminated by ſecret murther, while their friends are ignorant of their fate, or of the Lettre-de-cachet, the arbitrary mandate for their impriſonment. You remind me of a man, your baptiſmal name-ſake, whom a merry wag of a poet thus ſaucily characterizes:

" Mun very juſtly thinks the human back
" Should be to Kings a ſort of humble hack;
" That every ſubject ought to wear a ſaddle,
" O'er which thoſe great rough-riders, Kings, may
" ſtraddle."

But how came it to paſs, that, as goſſip report ſays, the eyes of a Britiſh Senator ſhould, in the poetical language of Shakeſpeare's Othello, " ſhed tears as faſt as the Arabian tree her me- " dicinal gums," when a foreign King and Queen were " *dragged in ſubmiſſive triumph by conquering ſub-* " *jects*," and yet be "unuſed to the melting mood" when the whole Britiſh nation deeply deplored the grievous indiſpoſition, with which it pleaſed God to viſit his own King? Here is an inconſiſtency in his "*ſenſibility*," for the indecorous expreſſion

of

of *God hurling the King from his throne*, or an expreſſion very ſimilar to it, ſaid to have iſſued from his lips in the Houſe of Commons in his ſpeech on the Regency Queſtion, proves, that it was not excited on this moſt melancholy occaſion. Or perhaps his ſorrowful ſenſibility was overpowered by the joyful hopes, that his party, who deſpaired of participating of the favour of the King, might engroſs the confidence of the Prince-Regent. In this caſe there might be more perſons than one, who, in the ardour of their zeal to pay court to the riſing ſun, renounced the ſemblance of prudence and decency in haſtily turning their backs on the departing ſplendour of the ſuppoſed ſetting luminary. But, alas! the chilling froſt of diſappointment nipped the opening bud of expectation. Do you know a man of the world, who, hackneyed in Court intrigue, and almoſt bewildered in a crooked labyrinth of a ſhuffling ſyſtem of politics, ſenſible of his error, and conſcious, that a perſeverance in his oppoſition to the meaſures of the able young gentleman at the head of adminiſtration, is not the avenue to Court favour, endeavours to attone for his paſt miſconduct, by obtruding on the public, in an incoherent declamatory Eſſay on the French Revolution, his crude ideas about political conſtitutions, founded neither in common ſenſe nor in nature, the mere ebullitions of a wild eccentric imagination? His principles of government however, originating in a ſuppoſed indefeaſible right of inheritance from forefathers, he fancies will powerfully operate as his

peace-maker at Court, and not only appeaſe offended majeſty, but prove a ſucceſsful advocate for an addition to the £1500 per annum ſecret penſion, he is ſaid to receive on the Iriſh eſtabliſhment. But, were I king of this country, I would never ſhew favour to a man, who did not reſt the principles of civil government, and my title to my hereditary crown, on the firm indeſtructible baſis of the original choice of the people, and of their continued acquieſcence in that choice.

Page 107, But to return to the *outrageous* treatment of the French king and queen "*lodged under* "*a guard of ſoldiers, in one of the old palaces of* "*Paris, now converted into a Baſtile for kings.*" On reading this paſſage, far different ſenſations pervaded my mind than thoſe, which gave birth to the following exclamatory rant;—"*Is this a triumph to be con-* "*ſecrated at altars?*" &c. &c. I was ſtruck with an awful admiration of the divine ſuperintendance and direction of human affairs by his train of natural events or ſecond cauſes, and more than ever convinced, that a juſt God will ſooner or later vindicate his own moral government of the world, and that the impriſonment of a king and queen in your new Baſtile was one proof, among many, of the verification of that fine moral paſſage in Horace,

"—— Raro antecedentem ſceleſtum
"Deſeruit pede pœna claudo."

Limping vengeance overtakes the ſinner at laſt, and as well in public as in private life. A French monarch, who inconſiderately, and, as it were, mechanically,

chanically, follows the example of his predeceſſors, in ſuffering his miniſters to hurry thoſe individuals, who in ſome way or other become obnoxious to their power, into perpetual confinement, is compelled to *taſte* the miſery of impriſonment, to experience it in his turn, though in an inferior degree, God "in" what is called "his wrath remembering mercy." May the French king and queen "humble themſelves under the mighty hand of "God!" May they acknowledge, that "the moſt "High ruleth in heaven, and giveth the kingdoms "of this world to whomſoever he will!" May they be thankful to their King, the King of kings, that he has not, by a different arrangement of events, deprived them of their crowns and lives! May they henceforth learn and practice this leſſon of philanthropy, that kings and queens ſhould act as paſtors to feed, not as butchers to fleece and ſlaughter their flock, the people, and "become," their "nurſing fathers and nurſing mothers!" Laſtly, may they never yield to the ſuggeſtions of thoſe, who wiſh to re-eſtabliſh their abſolute power, leſt, in conſequence of their abuſe of the divine mercy, they experience more dreadful evils than thoſe which have already fallen to their lot!

Page 107, I ſhall cloſe my remarks on the ſubject of your "*famous triumph*," with a cordial wiſh, that, as the cruel outrages of the day, heightened by your exaggerated deſcription, originated in the neglect of the late government to provide for the inſtruction

ſtruction of the poor in the common obligations of morality, and in their conſequent ignorance of the true meaning of the natural equal rights of men, the firſt legiſlative aſſembly would add to the many ſalutary decrees, which, as being founded on the moſt liberal and benevolent principles, reflect immortal honour on the late conſtitutive aſſembly, a law, which ſhall lay the axe to the root of this evil, and prevent future riots, by eſtabliſhing, at the public expence, ſchools for the education of the riſing generation of the poor in the obligations of religion, in the duties of morality, in the habits of induſtry, and in the knowledge of that only ſolid baſis of all government, the right of the people to elect their own governors.

Page 111, 112, "*I rejoice to hear that the great "lady,*" the French queen, "*in the laſt extremity, "will ſave herſelf from the laſt diſgrace, and that, if "ſhe muſt fall, ſhe will fall by no ignoble hand.*" As every hand muſt be ignoble in your judgment except her own fair hand, or the hand of her royal conſort, and I cannot think that you meaned to adviſe the French king to imbrue his hand with the blood of his own queen, I muſt ſuppoſe, there being no other king or queen on the ſpot, that you approve of the great lady's ſuppoſed intention, for Chriſtian charity forbids me to believe it real, in the laſt extremity to fall by her own hand, to incur the guilt of ſuicide. O rare excellent ſpecimen of moral rectitude, inculcated from the preſs by a member of the Britiſh Parliament

liament, by a privy counſellor of the Britiſh crown! Ye fair attendants on your royal miſtreſs, at the moment, when you behold the fatal poignard uplifted in her hand to plunge it in her own ſnow-white boſom, ſtrike ſimilar murtherous inſtruments into your own hearts deep, deep, to the hilt! It would be inglorious to ſurvive the ſelf-ſought fate of your miſtreſs; the voluntary loſs of life will be abundantly recompenſed by the immortal fame you will acquire from the magic pen of Mr. Burke. He will record the glorious atchievement in the moſt beautiful ſtrains of poetic proſe; or perhaps work it up with all the embelliſhments of ſtile into a perfect tragic drama. What a wonderfully fine ſtage-effect, though of the moſt horrid kind, muſt the ſcene produce, which repreſents your royal miſtreſs, encircled by you her loving and beloved dependants, all habited in mournful ſable, and at the ſame inſtant perpetrating the lethiferous deed to the adagio-ſound of ſolemn muſic?

But to be ſerious;—though I do not much approve of the high-ſounding titles uſually conferred on kings and queens, as they tend to diſtend their hearts with pride, and to diſpoſe them to look down with the ſupercilious eye of contempt on their fellow creatures, yet for once I feel myſelf inclined to comply with the ridiculous faſhion of the world, and, with a view to counteract the evil tendency of your immoral doctrine, ſhall preſume to addreſs the French queen in the following moſt reſpectful terms; happy however

however to find, that by her late concurrence with the king in the acceptance of the new free French conſtitution, all apprehenſions of her being reduced to the laſt extremity are entirely done away.

" May it pleaſe your majeſty,

" I ſincerely hope your majeſty will never expe-
" rience the laſt extremity alluded to in Mr. Burke's
" Reflections on the French Revolution. It is in-
" deed not only in your own power to prevent it,
" but to ſecure to yourſelf a throne in the hearts of
" the French people, by *conſecrating* the meridian
" and decline of your ſhort day of life to an active
" co-operation with the National Aſſembly in form-
" ing a plan of government calculated to promote
" the national ſecurity, liberty, and happineſs, in-
" ſtead of *proſtituting* them to the debaſing purpoſe
" of inventing ways and means to ſatisfy what can
" never be ſatiated, an extravagant penchant for the
" gew-gaw trappings of royalty, and for the expen-
" ſive ſupport of a falſe external ſplendour. But, if
" in conſequence of your majeſty's own miſconduct,
" originating in yourſelf, or in the pernicious advice
" of evil counſellors, the laſt extremity ſhould
" arrive, I humbly and earneſtly intreat you to reject
" Mr. Burke's ſuicidal counſel with a magnanimous
" diſdain. Tell him that Cato the Stoic was a
" coward.—Tell him that a queen is only truly
" brave, when ſhe dares to be miſerable.—Tell him
" that none but God, who gave you life, has a right
" to take it away."

CHAPTER

CHAPTER XI.

The Examiner's gratitude to Mr. Burke for tranſporting him from an horrid ſpectacle to a delightful viſion.—Mr. Burke's glowing deſcription of the fair Dauphineſs, calculated to excite the ardor of rapturous emotions in the hearts of his young readers among the men.—It produced ſomething of the tickling effervеſcence of an amorous ſenſation in the breaſt of his middle-aged Examiner.—Buxom widows' hearts not ſafe from its magic influence.—It's wonderful effect on a young beautiful ſpinſter of the Examiner's acquaintance.—A long narrative of the ſame.—How the young lady rapidly hurried through the pages of Mr. Burke's Reflections till her attention was arreſted by the delightful viſion.—How here, her ſpirits exhauſted, ſhe fell into a profound ſleep with Mr. Burke's pamphlet in her hand.—How the viſion produced a dream as extraordinary as the moſt extravagant vagaries of Mr. Burke's luxuriant fancy.---How ſhe was caught up into the Heathen-Heaven, ſaw all the gods and goddeſſes, and fell into a ſwoon.---Her recovery from it.---The jealouſy her ſudden appearance cauſed among the goddeſſes.---How, by the aid of Venus, ſhe ſaw Mr. Burke aſtride Pegaſus in his flight to the Morning Star.---How ſhe became a favourite with the queen of love, who holds a long converſation with her, obſerving that ſhe reſembled the fair Dauphineſs in air, ſhape, features, and complexion, gives orders to her three attiring maids to dreſs her out for conqueſt on her return to earth.---How ſhe is conveyed down in the goddeſſes car, driven by the gallant charioteer Cupid, with many other particulars concerning the Ceſtus of Venus, her doves and ſwans, and a deſcription of the car.---Laſtly, how ſhe awakes, and the ſequel.---The Examiner concludes with a brief account of a ſober matron's remark on Mr. Burke's delightful viſion.

AT page 112, I have cauſe to thank you for relieving my mind from a horrid ſanguinary ſpectacle, and diverting it to the pleaſing contemplation of a ſcene of "*ſplendour, joy, and gaiety,*" of the charming "*delightful viſion*" of the French queen, when a lovely Dauphineſs, "in flower of youth and "beauty's pride." It is, in truth, a glowing deſcription; and though in you, who have paſſed your grand climacteric, and conſequently may have acquired the ſang-froid of a ſpiritual Platoniſt, it may excite no other ideas than "*thoſe of enthuſiaſtic,* "*diſtant, reſpectful love,*" yet there is a certain luſciouſneſs in it, which cannot fail to raiſe amorous ſenſations, partaking more of the fleſh than of the ſpirit, in your young readers. In this ſenſe, like as Dean Swift's "nice man is a man of naſty ideas," you, a ſpiritual lover, unintentionally become a man of carnal ideas. The warmth and eagerneſs of the paſſions and deſires of youth want not your kindling efforts to ſet them in a blaze. In pity to them you ſhould have adminiſtered rather ſedatives than ſtimulatives. I fear ſo delightful a viſion inſpires them with a rapturous ardour to a cloſer and more familiar attachment to the fair Dauphineſs, than is ſtrictly conſiſtent with your "*diſtant, reſpectful, love.*"— Even on me, entered into the autumnal "*Sere*" of life, having the honour to be born in the ſame year and month with my king, paſt the heyday of the blood, when a luxuriant ſpring-tide of health

dances

dances in the veins, the faſcinating traits of the pencil of your imagination have ſo commanding an influence, that, though they did not make my blood and ſpirits ferment and boil, yet they ſet them ſimmering like a frumety-kettle, and created in me a kind of hankering longing for the poſſeſſion of ſo beautiful an object. For, as you (page 114) juſtly obſerve, and many a true word is ſaid in irony, " *a queen is but a woman, a woman is but an* " *animal, and that not of the higheſt order,*" if ſhe be habitually immoral in her conduct, or a devotee to " the luſt of the fleſh, the luſt of the eyes, and the " pride of life." The hearts of bonny buxom widows, practiſed in the arts of love, yielding like wax, ſuſceptible of every tender impreſſion, it may be preſumed, diſpoſe them to a wiſh to reſemble your lovely portraiture of the Dauphineſs, with a view to inſpire the men with the ſoft feelings of the gentle paſſion for themſelves. But the effect it has produced on the mind of a young maiden lady, who ſhall be nameleſs, I am enabled to relate. She is the very counterpart of your fair Dauphineſs, tall and ſtrait as a poplar, flaxen haired like the Auſtrian family, her beautiful treſſes flowing in ringlets adown her neck, which, in the warm figurative language of a king not leſs amorous than wiſe, is " as a tower " of ivory," and deſcending to her " two breaſts," which are " like two young roes that are twins, or " as two cluſters of the vine." Her eyes " *glitter-* " *ing like the Morning Star* ;" her " lips like a thread

" of

"of ſcarlet," and ſhaming the vermillion of the ruby; and in her cheeks the bluſh of the roſe and the whiteneſs of the lily are rivals for pre-eminence. Ever "*full of life and joy*" as ſhe is, I remarked to her one day, that ſhe ſurpaſſed her uſual ſprightlineſs and vivacity, "and pray Miſs," added "I, explain to me the meaning of this new trick of "levity, which you ſeem ſo fond of practiſing, with "much adroitneſs and agility, that quick-revolving "circumgyratory motion on the tip-toe of one foot, "as though you had no uſe for the other."— "What, my old friend, do you not know? why I "am but juſt "*alighted on this orb, which*" you "ſee I "*hardly ſeem to touch*." But how ſhould "you know? well then, I will relate to you the "ſweeteſt dream, the moſt delightful viſion, I ever "had in my life! You know that, fantaſtical, "giddy-brained, and fooliſh as I may appear to "thoſe, who are not well acquainted with me, I never "cheriſhed ſuch an irreſiſtible penchant for romances "and novels, as not to be without my ſerious "moments, when I dip into religion and poli-"tics. You may be ſure a girl of my inſatiable "curioſity could not reſt, till ſhe became one of the "20,000 purchaſers of Mr. Burke's Reflections on "the Revolution in France. I at once dropped all "my light airs, and prepared myſelf with much "mental gravity for the ſlow, quiet peruſal of a "work, which I apprehended would abound with "much cloſe reaſoning, and deep philoſophic theory.

"But

" But, to my aſtoniſhment, I no ſooner entered on
" the peruſal, than I found it to be a mere romance,
" a poem in proſe, or an undefinable whip-ſyllabub
" declamation, which amuſed my imagination in-
" ſtead of informing and improving my judgment.
" In vain did I look for the ſhadow of an argument;
" ſo my conſtitutional levity returned with redou-
" bled force; and with the impatience of diſappoint-
" ment I rapidly hurried through a number of
" pages about a *Conſtitutional Society* and a *Society*
" *for Revolutions*; about *Dr. Price* and an *Hugh*
" *Peters*; about *caſhiering kings, the ſervants of the*
" *people for miſconduct*; about an *inheritable crown*, an
" *inheritable peerage, and an Houſe of Commons and a*
" *people inheriting privileges, franchiſes and liberties*;
" about a French *National Aſſembly, compoſed of*
" *country attornies, country clowns, country curates,*
" ignorant *traders and ſtock jobbers, unlearned pro-*
" *feſſors of medicine, and turbulent diſcontented men of*
" *quality*, all conſpiring to form not a reſpectable
" legiſlative council, but a mere den of canibals,
" diſtained with human gore, like that of carnivorous
" Cacus of old, about *tous les evêques a la lanterne*;
" and about a royal tragic triumphal raree-ſhew
" proceſſion from Verſailles to Paris. At length I
" came to the delightful viſion at page 112. De-
" lighted as I was with a deſcription calculated to
" inſpire delight, my ſpirits, long on the ſtretch,
" became ſo exhauſted with the unremitting exertion,
" that I inſenſibly dropped aſleep in my chair with the

" book in my hand. I inſtantly found myſelf
" tranſported into the Heathen Heaven, ſurrounded
" with the Pantheon of ancient mythology; but
" before I could recognize the ſeveral celeſtials of
" both ſexes, I perceived the young urchin Cupid,
" by his mother's ſide, aiming an arrow at my heart.
" I could not forbear betraying my fears, when
" Venus, obſerving my diſtreſs, gently put his bow
" and ſhafts aſide, and, advancing with an engaging,
" gracious air, chided me, but in the mildeſt terms,
" for my preſumption, as a mortal, in intruding
" into the aſſembly of immortals." 'Beſides,' "added
" ſhe," 'your beauty will occaſion war in heaven.—I
'ſee Jove already caſting amorous glances at you,
'and Juno viewing you aſkance with jealous eyes.
'I too ſhall not be without my ſuſpicions of your
'attempt to ſupplant me in my red-coat gallant
'Mars. Behold he is now ogling you with all
'the ardour of military rapture. As to my old
'huſband there, limping Mulciber, the full enjoy-
'ment of his embraces is much at your ſervice.
'But I ſuppoſe my voluntary reſignation of him
'would not content you; and indeed I have already
'conceived ſuch a regard for you, that I would not
'wiſh your charms, like creeping ivy twining round
'the ſapleſs trunk and branches of an hollow tree,
'ſhould wither by the ſide of an antiquated lover.
'Your inſtant deſcent therefore to that inſular ſpeck
'of earth, Britain, from whence you came, is abſo-
'lutely neceſſary, eſpecially as I obſerve that the

'ſtern,

'ſtern, frowning, armed goddeſs there, Minerva,
'ſhaking her dreadful Ægis at us. I can gueſs at
'her meaning. She, in her wiſdom, thinks that as my
'beauty gives her plague enough, ſhe can well diſ-
'penſe with the appearance of a rival Venus to aid
'me in my perpetual oppoſition to thoſe her very
'ſage maxims, with which ſhe is always boring the
'ears of the gods, provoked at their manifeſt par-
'tiality to my inſinuating wiles, and endearing trium-
'phant charms.'—" The queen of love and ſmiles
" had no ſooner ended, but, ſcared with a ſudden hoot
" of the owl, perched on Minerva's creſt, and my
" heart petrified with the fierce terrific countenance
" of the Gorgon Meduſa pourtrayed on her ſhield,
" whoſe writhing ſnakes hiſſed and darted their
" forky tongues at me, my feeble tottering knees
" refuſed any longer to ſuſtain their natural load,
" my trembling body, and I ſank down in a ſwoon
" at the feet of Venus. On my recovery, the god-
" deſs, regarding me with the tendereſt looks of
" benignity and compaſſion, ſtretched out her lilly
" white arm to raiſe me up, while her fair atten-
" dants, Aglaia and her ſiſter graces, Euphroſyne
" and Thalia, were buſy in adminiſtering their kind
" offices to reſtore me to my ſenſes, one applying a
" poignant ſmelling bottle of heavenly fragrance to
" my noſtrils; probably its contents were nectar
" double-diſtilled; another gently chaffing my
temples with the ſame precious eſſence, and the
" third ſupporting and aſſiſting me to riſe. The

" involuntary burſt of a flood of tears reliev'd
" me, and the kind words," 'Beauteous mortal!
'be comforted,' "iſſuing from the roſeate lips of
" the goddeſs in an accent ineffably ſoft and ſweet,
" encouraged me to ſpeak, eſpecially as ſhe gave me
" to underſtand that ſhe had involved my perſon in
" a miſt, which made me inviſible to the reſt of the
" gods, though they were viſible to me, in like man-
" ner as ſhe protected her beloved ſon Æneas and
" his friend Achates through the ſtreets of Carthage,
" till they arrived at the court and in the preſence of
" Dido. I aſſured her I had unwittingly offended;
" that I knew not how I had riſen from my own
" ſublunary ſphere; that indeed, being naturally
" ſprightly, volatile, fond of novelty, and full of
" curioſity, I had formed an intention, if that truly
" ſcientific Frenchman, Monſieur Blanchard, had
" reviſited my native iſle, to have ſolicited an excur-
" ſion with him into the aërial regions in his balloon;
" but, as that event had not happened, my ſurprize at
" finding myſelf ſuddenly tranſported into the celeſ-
" tial court of Jove was equal to the difficulty I labour-
" ed under in contriving how to deſcend to the earth in
" ſafety. I was without wings, but wings in truth,
" would be uſeleſs to me, unſkilled as I was in the
" management of them. Venus ſmiled at my artleſs
" ſimplicity, and ſaid," 'I will provide for your de-
'ſcent without the leaſt danger to your perſon.
'Behind that pale-faced old maid of a goddeſs there
'with a creſcent on her forehead, (I beg Luna's pardon,

'chaſte

'chaſte as the prude would be thought, her amour
'with Endymion is no ſecret) you ſee a youthful
'god, his temples crowned with laurel, and en-
'circled with a bandeau of luminous rays, ſitting on
'an eminence, amid a ſurrounding groupe of virgins,
'chaunting to the ſtrains of his lyre. They are the
'nine muſes, and he Phœbus or Apollo. His tem-
'per has indeed been ſomewhat ſoured by his priſ-
'tine diſappointment with his firſt love, the coy
'Daphne; but he is a god of ſuch polite accompliſh-
'ments, that he would not refuſe, eſpecially at my
'ſolicitation, a pretty woman the uſe of his winged
'ſteed, Pegaſus, to carry her ſafe down to earth.
'But, on recollection, a privy-counſellor of the king
'of your iſle has borrowed him, an iſle, by the bye, as
'dear to me as Cyprus, Cythera, and Idalia of old;
'nor am I an unconcerned ſpectatrix of any material
'tranſaction which paſſes there in my province of love.
'I will but paſs our celeſtial herb Moly, gently acroſs
'your eyelids, to remove the mortal film from your
'ſight, and you ſhall ſee the ſage adviſer of your king
'ſoaring on the back of the flying horſe to yon
'bright luminary, Phoſphorus, or the morning-ſtar.'
"Inſtantly, on her application of this wonder-work-
"ing plant to my eyes, I was ſenſible of an improve-
"ment and diſtinctneſs of viſion, which I never be-
"fore experienced; and gueſs, my friend, my aſtoniſh-
"ment, when I beheld our adventurous Knight-errant
"advanced aſtride the winged animal, in the vicinity
"of the glittering orb. Homer's laughter-loving

" goddeſs, perceiving my ſurprize, freely indulged " her propenſity to riſibility.'

'You cannot divine,' " ſays ſhe," the object of 'that preſumptuous mortal's daring flight. Poor 'Pegaſus no longer kicks and flings; and, by the 'fluttering of his pinions, I perceive the poor beaſt 'is ſpurred and jaded to death, if a ſtate of non-exiſt-'ence were not denied him. Jove, out of pure re-'gard to Apollo and his own daughters by Mnemo-'ſyne, the tuneful nine Aonian maidens, conferred 'immortality upon him, which is now the noble 'animal's greateſt miſery. But, not to detain you 'longer in a cruel ſuſpenſe, I am certain you will 'join in the laugh with me, when I inf rm you, that 'the romantic chevalier's ſole object in view is to 'pluck from Phoſphorus his moſt ſcintillant rays, 'to give a dazzling luſtre to the eyes of his fair 'dauphineſs.

'Now, as Pegaſus is engaged, I would confide 'your ſafe deſcent to earth to Jove's meſſenger 'Mercury, that nimble footed god you ſee behind 'Jove's chair of ſtate, with his caduceus, winged 'Petaſus, and talaria. But his godſhip is ſo addic-'ted to tricks and thievery, that I am under appre-'henſion, he might filch from you that which is 'moſt dear and valuable to you before you are 'aware. Beſides, in truth, for him to fly downward 'with ſo fine a girl in his arms, would be a temptation 'too ſtrong to be reſiſted; for, *under the roſe* of 'my ſhield of love here, ſomething little leſs miſ-

'chievous

'chievous lurks in our divine Ichor, than in your 'human fleſh and blood. Cupid knows, Mercury's 'heart is made of very penetrable ſtuff; not like 'thoſe of Pallas and the muſes, which are formed 'of ſuch obdurate materials, that they repel his 'ſhafts, which recoil with blunted points on him-'ſelf.

'Solicitous therefore that you deſcend to your 'own iſle without harm, for, though you muſt 'not be my rival in heaven, you ſhall be my 'repreſentative on earth, I will apply to that good 'humoured girl of a goddeſs, you ſee by the ſide 'of Juno, dreſt in a light flaming robe of variega-'ted hues, her meſſenger Iris, for the loan of her 'rainbow, on which you may deſcend with ſafety. 'But, now I recollect, as it is the property of that "bow never to be employed but when Phœbus 'ſhines in full ſplendour in a ſhower of rain, by this 'mode of conveyance, your pretty perſon cannot 'deſcend without ſuffering from the wet, and the 'conſequent hazard of a cold, which may have a 'fatal termination. You ſhall therefore ſail down-'wards through the air in my own car, drawn by 'my favourite pair of ſwans, and Cupid ſhall be 'your charioteer.'—"So ſaying, ſhe beckoned to "the young god of love, and gave him directions to "get the carriage ready immediately." 'Now,' "ſays ſhe," 'while my ſon is buſied in preparing 'the car, do you,' ("addreſſing herſelf to her three "beautiful maids of honour,") 'unite in ſetting

'off

'off the charms of this fair mortal to the moſt cap-
'tivating advantage. Fetch, Aglaia, my beſt tiara,
'and, to give it a more than common luſtre, dip it
'in Sol's rays;—bring, Euphroſyne, my moſt airy
'robe of pureſt white;—and do you, Thalia, faſten
'on her feet my brighteſt ſandals, that pair, which
'is ornamented in front with a bunch of roſe-
'coloured ſilk, and ſet with ſtuds impearled with
'the dew of heaven, cryſtallized into a luſtre out-
'ſparkling the brilliancy of the diamond.'—"I
"was ſoon equipped in complete celeſtial elegance
"from head to foot, but my face was ſo covered with
"bluſhes, the tell-tales of the confuſed ſtate of my
"mind, at the honours, which my celeſtial benefac-
"treſs deigned to confer on me, that my tongue
"faltered in the attempt to articulate my thanks,
"and I was deprived of all power to acknowledge
"my gratitude, but by the expreſſive ſilence of a low
"reſpectful curtſey. Venus, perceiving my diſtreſs
"of mind and flutter of ſpirits, occaſioned by an
"heart overwhelmed with its grateful ſenſations
"increaſed them by aſſuring me;" 'My ſweet girl!
'I have not yet finiſhed your dreſs.' "Then, with
"a moſt winning air of affability and condeſcenſion
"looſening her own beautiful ceſtus from her lovely
"waſte, and approaching me with a benignant ſmile,
"added," 'I muſt be your attre-woman in this
'finiſhing article of your dreſs,' "and with her
"own fair hands faſtened it round my waiſt." 'The
'property of this ceſtus,' "continued ſhe," 'is to
'diffuſe

'diffuſe ſuch an ineffable grace over your features 'and perſon, as not to fail of inſpiring love into the 'hearts of all beholders; and, by my power, as 'queen of love and beauty, I have beſtowed ſuch a 'magic influence on it, that it gives you ſo complete 'a reſemblance of the fair Dauphineſs, that her '*Platonic paramour* ſhall not be able to diſtinguiſh 'between you, and the queen of the French as 'depicted by him in that youthful character.'—

"Perceiving, that my little gallant charioteer was "now ready to hand me into the carriage, Venus "ſaluted me with a kiſs ſo inexpreſſibly ſweet, that my "young countrymen would have died with extacy "at the ſoft impreſſion of ambroſial dew from her "roſeate lips." 'I part with you with reluctance,' "concluded ſhe," 'but I will be your protectreſs, and 'will commiſſion Cupid to transfix with one of his 'unerring golden ſhafts the breaſt of an accom-'pliſhed lover, who ſhall be worthy of your hand 'and heart. Accept this pair of billing, cooing 'doves, as a preſent from Venus, and an apt emblem 'of your future conjugal felicity. I will perſuade 'my father Jove, who is too ſenſible of the power 'of love, to refuſe his daughter any boon, to hold a 'gala to night in honour of you my fair delegate in 'Britain. Mars ſhall give a toaſt to the ſucceſs of 'your beauty, Bacchus get tipſy in filling bum-'pers of nectar to it, and rigid Pallas herſelf 'not refuſe to take one ſober glaſs in your cauſe, 'when I preſent a petition to her, praying that, as I

'do

'do not abound in prudence, ſhe would impart a 'portion of her wiſdom to guard your innocence 'from the ſeduction, to which your tranſcendent 'beauty expoſes you.'—" She then put into my " hands, the pair of doves, and I took my leave of " Venus and her fair attendants, with eyes ſwim- " ming with tears, the tears of joy and gratitude, " aſcending the car with the aid of my winged " ſquire. I ſhall not detain you with a minute " deſcription of it. Suffice it to ſay, that it was " one entire beautiful conch, arching over our heads; " the necks of the ſtately ſwans decorated with " zones of the colour of a maiden's bluſh, embel- " liſhed with gems; the reins of purple ſilk ſtudded " with gold; the handle of Cupid's whip of coral, " and its laſh of the ſtrings of lover's hearts. " Cupid remarking that a more rapid flight of the " ſwans produced a vertigo in my head, kindly " ſlackened their pace, for he had them as perfectly " under command, and managed them with as much " adroitneſs as you have ſeen lady S—— and lady " A—— drive their four bays or greys in hand " round Hyde Park and its environs. We were " not long in performing our aërial deſcent, and " without a ſingle accident lighted ſafe on the " mount in Kenſington Gardens, where I had " requeſted my charioteer to ſet me down, as being " near my home, the habitation of my parents. " The young god politely handed me down from the " car, when, on turning round to thank him for his

" care

" care and attention, behold, his godſhip, ſwans, car,
" and doves were all vaniſhed. In ſhort I awaked,
" and, to my unſpeakable grief and diſappointment,
" found the whole a dream. However as ſoon as
" I could recover from my ſurprize, I formed a
" deſign of ordering a dreſs exactly according to the
" pattern given me by Venus in my " *delightful*"
" dream, and I now appear before you with my
" ſandals, my ceſtus, and my tiara. I have alſo
" provided myſelf with a pair of doves greatly
" reſembling thoſe preſented by Venus in my dream,
" which you ſhall ſee, when you favour me with a
" call. As to the milk-white ſwans, I muſt not
" think of purchaſing a ſimilar pair till I be poſſeſſed
" of a large piece of water for them to ſwim in at
" their pleaſure, in my lord's park; for I am already
" wedded in idea to nothing leſs than a coronet, and
" hope ſoon to be in reality.—I know, my old
" friend, you are too ſincere to ſpoil me with adula-
" tion; but now you muſt humour my vanity ſo
" far, and every woman has a greater or leſs ſhare
" of it, as to acknowledge, that this elegant dreſs,
" with my tolerable face and perſon, are ſo faſcina-
" ting, that they cannot but captivate the heart of
" ſome one or more of Mr. Burke's young ariſto-
" crats, whether Engliſh or French. I hope you
" do not think," ' when riding in my chariot, a lady
' great I be,' " honours will ſo change my manners,
" that I ſhall look down with diſdain on you. No,
" never truſt your favourite Caroline again, if I do

" not

" not ſtop my carriage, ſeat you by my ſide, take
" you to my fine houſe, and preſent you to my lord.
" By your long friendſhip for me I conjure you to
" obtain an introduction of me to Mr. Burke.
" He will be ſo ſtruck with my flaxen hair, my blue
" eyes, my light airy figure, " *full of life, ſplendour,*
" *and joy*, which inſtead of treading, *hardly ſeems to*
" *touch this orb*, and my tout-enſemble reſemblance of
" *the Dauphineſs at Verſailles*, that, if his temper
" be not ſoured (and his propenſity to ſarcaſm
" gives me cauſe to ſuſpect it is none of the ſweet-
" eſt) by the anſwers of his numerous opponents,
" and particularly of his victorious antagoniſts, the
" blunt Mr. Paine, and the polite Mr. Mackintoſh,
" who have completely defeated the valourous cheva-
" lier on the plain fair field of truth and argument, he
" will not heſitate, out of pure regard to the ſtrong
" likeneſs I bear to that *great lady*, to honour me
" with his notice, and bring me forward into the beſt
" and moſt faſhionable company, where my only
" difficulty will be among a groupe of handſome
" young noblemen, to fix on one moſt worthy of my
" hand and heart."—Having finiſhed theſe words
ſhe left me no time for reply, but ſpringing from
me in an inſtant, tripped it along, with wonderful
agility, on the light fantaſtic toe, till ſhe was quite
out of ſight. " There," ſaid I, " ſhe goes, or rather
" flies, conquering and to conquer, and may ſucceſs
" attend her equal to her wiſhes, !"

This

This tale I own is rather of the longeſt, but, if it contribute to the amuſement of my readers as much as it has relieved me from the ennui ſuperinduced on my ſpirits by your political rhodomontade, your fulſome panegyric on ariſtocrats and hierarchs, and your ſarcaſtic invectives againſt all revoluioniſts, my end in relating it is fully anſwered.

The effect which your glowing deſcription of the dauphineſs produced on a married lady of my acquaintance, will not engroſs ſo many pages in the relation, as were neceſſarily beſtowed on tranſcribing the preceding narrative of the ſprightly maiden. The matron in queſtion, though neither plain nor elderly, is not one of the Meſſalinas of the age, gameſome, unprincipled women of faſhion, who ſeem to wed for no other purpoſes than by commiting a faux pas with other men, at, or before, the expiration of the honey-moon, to provoke their huſbands to ſue for a divorce. No! ſhe is one of thoſe amiable conſtant ſober wives, who practiſe the apoſtle Paul's obſolete precept, to "love their huſbands and to love their children." On hearing the paſſage read to her, ſhe exclaimed with a ſerio-comic ſmile, "Naughty man!" meaning you, Mr. Burke, "to tempt my "huſband to ſin, even in idea, with the Dauphineſs "of France."

CHAP-

CHAPTER XII.

Mr. Burke's automata ſwords.—The age of chivalry ſurvives in the perſon of Mr. Burke.—Mr. Burke's aſſertion that vice loſt half it's evil by loſing all it's groſſneſs, a groſs error.—The extinction of the feudal ſyſtem of polity deſirable.—The truth of the converſe of a propoſition of Mr. Burke aſſerted.—Mr Burke's flouriſhing condition of Europe contradicted.—French commerce and the arts not endangered by Mr. Burke's hypothetical IF.—Remonſtrance againſt Mr. Burke's exchange of a proteſtant rabbin for a popiſh archbiſhop.—Mr. Burke's objects of awe, affection, duty, reverence, and reſpect conſidered.—Mr. Burke's high-flying notions of the conſecrated revenue of the Church examined.—Mr. Burke the accompliſhed gentleman.—Inquiry into Mr. Burke's independency of the church on the crown, and his conſequences of it's dependance on any other.—Obſervations on Mr. Burke's aſſertion reſpecting the confiſcation of the eſtates of the church.—Argumentum ad hominem.—Proved, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, that the increaſing population of a country, and a large quantity of circulating coin, are not certain ſtandards of the mildneſs of it's government.---Remarks on Mr. Burke's account of the French nobleſſe in particular, and his ſentiments on the order of nobility in general.

PASSING by your "*thought*," that "*ten thouſand*" automata "*ſwords muſt have leaped from "their ſcabbards to avenge even a look, which "threatened her*," the French Queen, "*with inſult*," I cannot agree with you, page 113, that "*the age of "chivalry*

" *chivalry is gone.*" No! it ſurvives in it's full wild romantic perfection in your perſon, and I expected at the end of the laſt ſeſſion of Parliament to have heard of your departure for France, to aſſume the character of Quixote to your great Lady, to ſeat her on a milk-white palfrey, to employ Monſieur De Calonne, your fellow advocate for ariſtocracy, to lead the ſlow-paced beaſt, and to proceed with the injured dame and truſty ſquire, armed cap-a-pie with ſword and lance, to deſtroy that enchanted caſtle, the National Aſſembly. I much fear indeed, that it is ſo faſt bound with the ſpells of the national love, and approbation of the conduct of it's members, that, as you are no conjuror, with magic wand to diſſolve the charm, you may fail in the adventurous enterprize. However you may ſafely attempt the deſtruction without the leaſt hazard of the fate of the *lantern*, for, if you ſhould not ſucceed, they will only laugh, like Job's " Leviathan, at the ſhaking " of your ſpear."

Your poſition, that " *vice loſt half it's evil by loſing all it's groſſneſs,*" is a groſs error. On the contrary, vice becomes more dangerous, the more it is diſguiſed by delicate refinements ſo; hideouſly deformed is vice in it's natural ſhape that men and women avoid the monſter; but when veiled with the ſemblance of virtue, and the Angel of darkneſs aſſumes the appearance of an Angel of light, it proves too ſucceſsful in it's allurements.

Page 116. You dread the general extinction throughout

throughout Europe of "*the old feudal and chivalrous "ſpirit of fealty.*" With me the extinction would be a matter of joy, becauſe it would give equal freedom to the whole human race. To the immortal honour of the King of Poland, like Titus, the delight of mankind, and to the eternal glory of it's truly illuſtrious nobles, "*the old feudal-ſpirit is extinct,*" by their voluntary admiſſion of the peaſantry to the natural rights of citizenſhip. In France this baſe enſlaving ſyſtem of polity is "*extinct,*" through the perſevering ſpirit of a people determined to be free. They have deſtroyed all the remains of the power of the great Barons in the ſuppreſſion of the order of nobility. In France no Signeuires or uſurped manerial rights, now exiſt; no lands held in homage on the bended knee, or baſe copyhold-tenures; no game-laws, no privileged monopoly of their right of ſhooting a bird. There all is allodial, as in the times of our Saxon anceſtors. There that tyrannous ſyſtem is annihilated, which, like a blight, blaſts the fair bloſſoms of the mild ſpirit of equal liberty. There Europe, loſt in aſtoniſhment, beholds an happy emancipation from ariſtocratic encroachments on that only true ſolid baſis of every political eſtabliſhment, a ſacred regard to the natural equal rights of men.

You contend, "*kings will be tyrants from policy,* "*when ſubjects are rebels from principle.*" I muſt aſſume the licenſe to reverſe this propoſition, with ſome little variation of expreſſion. The people, who in this country are, and in every country ought

to

to be, in common with Kings, ſubjects of the law only, will be inſurgents from principle, when Kings are tyrants from policy; and, I will add, that the page of hiſtory, ancient and modern, will furniſh us with innumerable woeful inſtances of rebellion in Kings againſt the people, for one inſtance of reſiſtence in the people to Kings.

" *Europe, taken in a maſs, was in a flouriſhing condition* " *the day on which your*," the French " *Revolution was* " *completed.*" How ſo? when, in conſequence of the people not only not poſſeſſing their proper importance, the ſole influence, but not even a material degree of weight, in the ſcale of government, in any nation in Europe, and ſtill leſs in thoſe where the regal and ariſtocratic powers are predominant, monopolizing the legiſlative, judicial, and executive functions, they are fleeced of their property, as well in peace as in war, and in the latter caſe, led, like ſheep to the ſlaughter, to gratify the ambitious or capricious will of deſpots. Page 118. " *If commerce and the arts* " *ſhould be loſt in an experiment to try how well a ſtate* " *may ſtand without theſe old fundamental principles*," viz. " *the ſpirit of nobility and religion.*" That by religion you mean here, not religion in the abſtract, but religion in the concrete, or civil eſtabliſhment in religion in general, and the French in particular, will not admit a doubt. I may venture to affirm, that the exiſtence of commerce and the arts in France are not endangered by your hypothetical *If.* On the contrary, the fact is, both are ſo far from being

loſt in the wiſe experiment of ſuppreſſing the ariſtocracy and hierarchy, that the bleſſed effects of the ſuppreſſion are already viſible in their more than gradual recovery from their former drooping, languiſhing ſtate. Commerce and the arts now revive, and thrive in France, and why? becauſe the whole weight of the taxes for the ſupport of their new government fall not on the people at large, to the exemption of the nobility. Theſe now ſtripped of their fanciful diſtinctions, which degrade and debaſe human nature, and exalted in common with the reſt of their ſpecies, their rank as men, are made to bear their ſhare of neceſſary taxation. Again, Commerce and the arts now thrive in France, becauſe that immenſe landed property, which had been inveigled from the people by the craft of the ſecular, and ſtill more, of the regular clergy, of the various monaſtic orders, taking a baſe advantage of the credulities of the ſuperſtitious multitude, in what are called the middle ages of European barbariſm and ignorance, is now, by a judicious decree of the late conſtitutive National Aſſembly, reſtored to the right owners, of which they had been defrauded by holy impoſters, at the ſame time that a decent proviſion for life is made for their preſent ſucceſſors in the *conſecrated* juggling trade. Laſtly, French commerce and arts revive and thrive, becauſe in the deſtruction of the ariſtocracy and the hierarchy the fall of monarchic deſpotiſm is involved paſt recovery, of which they were the grand ſupporters, and no inconſiderable partakers.

I ſhall now paſs by your farraginous maſs of invective againſt the French people, their National Aſſembly, Dr. Price, and Lord George Gordon, with that ſovereign contempt which they cannot but experience from the national and private characters ſo unjuſtly traduced, and a contempt mixed with a ſpecies of pity for that ſtrong appearance of a derangement of intellects, which could give birth to ſuch extraordinary defamatory rant. With reſpect to Dr. Price, his memory will be immortal when his doughty calumniator's fame is in a ſtate of putreſcence. However, I muſt arreſt you in your rapid courſe of illiberality at page 125. "*Send us* "*your Popiſh Archbiſhop, and we will ſend you our* "*Proteſtant Rabbin,*" meaning Lord George Gordon, and proteſt againſt this challenged exchange in the following apoſtrophe. 'My good French friends 'and neighbours, I earneſtly intreat you to keep 'your Archbiſhop to yourſelves, with his' '*pious* '*fund of hoſpitality, bounty, and charity.*' 'My 'countrymen are in poſſeſſion of two Archbiſhops; 'and there are ſome *wicked* men among us, not 'ſo very *religious* as Mr Burke, as well Heretics 'of the eſtabliſhment as anti-hierarchial Diſſenters, 'who, if they do not think that two Archbiſhops 'are two too many, may deem a third ſuperfluous. 'No doubt the Engliſh court finds two metropolitans 'very *uſeful*; but I never yet heard even of a mini-'ſterof the crown, who expreſſed a wiſh to add to the 'number. Beſides, the poor of London are of a 'ſpirit too generous to think of robbing the poor of

'Paris of their juſter claim to the benefits iſſuing 'from their Archbiſhop's fund. Excuſe us from 'engaging in this one ſpecies of mercantile barter, 'propoſed by Mr. Burke, together with the ſlave 'trade, and by my conſent, all other articles of ex-'port and import ſhall paſs duty-free between Eng-'land and France.' Commercial liberty, mutual and univerſal, with theſe two exceptions, preſents the moſt efficacious means to eſtabliſh a laſting friendſhip and harmony between two neighbouring nations, whom the heretofore wretched and wicked ſyſtem of policy of their reſpective courts have inhumanly exaſperated againſt each other, as hereditary enemies.

At page 128, you offend againſt Horace's maxim, 'metiri ſe quemque ſuo modulo ac pede verum 'eſt,' meaſure not another man's corn by your own buſhel. You ſay '*we look up with awe to Kings.*' By ſubſtituting the firſt plural pronoun primitive for the firſt ſingular, you preſume to ſpeak in the name of the whole Britiſh nation. You anſwer for them, as though their ideas were correſpondent to your own. I rather think the bulk of the people, at leaſt the intelligent among them, whether learned or unlearned, "*the true ſupporters of all liberal and manly morals,*" diſdain to practiſe this your *elevation of the eyes to Kings*, in your unlimited, unqualified ſenſe, and "*with awe*" in no ſenſe whatever. They know how to reſpect theſe their firſt ſervants, while they really ſerve and protect them their maſters, from whom

whom, under God, they derive their executive power. They know alſo how to deſpiſe them, if they abuſe, or ſuffer their miniſters to abuſe, the important delegated truſt. But they never look up with awe, or dread, to thoſe inſignificant baubles crowns, or, the wearers of them. A proper ſenſe of their own importance, of their own majeſty as principals, teaches them not to over-value *deputed* majeſty, and to look down with ſcorn on *the thing*, when *it* fulfills not, or counteracts, the end of *its* appointment.

"*We look up with affection to Parliaments.*" Yes; Britons love their repreſentatives, when they be intent on legiſlating for the public good; but when they be engroſſed by a ſordid attention to their own private emolument, in a mercenary traffic with the miniſter of the day, they *look down* on them with contempt and deteſtation.

"*We look up with duty to magiſtrates.*" Britons are more diſtinguiſhed by obedience to juſt laws, than by your vague and undefined idea of duty to the diſpenſers of them.

"*We look up with reverence to prieſts.*" Britons, revere God alone. Reverence to prieſts is ſo far from forming an article of their creed and practice, that the very name of prieſt is little leſs than diſguſting, and the epithet of *Reverend* appropriated to thoſe who are ignominiouſly termed the inferior clergy, *very* Reverend to Deans, *Right* Reverend to Biſhops, preſumptuouſly and nonſenſicaly ſtiled *Fathers-in-God*, and *Moſt* Reverend to Archbiſhops,

meets their juſt indignation and abhorrence. But they look with eſteem on thoſe miniſters of the Goſpel, who inculcate from the preſs or pulpit doctrines calculated to work a moral reformation among men, to promote the practice of that amiable Chriſtian precept, univerſal benevolence operating in beneficence, and to diffuſe the knowledge not more of the ſpecies of ſocial liberty, uſualy denominated religious, than that which is termed civil and political, as being not leſs an eſſential branch of Chriſtian morality, than the former, on all ſuitable occaſions; and more particularly, when they behold the government of any country verging towards deſpotiſm, it is the duty of preachers of the goſpel to be earneſt in ſupporting the cauſe of political liberty, and explaining its advantages, in their public harangues, in their printed tracts, and in their private converſation. And indeed it is neceſſary they ſhould, to counteract the pernicious effects of the ſlaviſh political tenets of thoſe eccleſiaſtical court ſycophants, who may be inſtrumental in introducing the old exploded doctrine of *jure divino* right, under cover of your new fangled ſyſtem of ancient uſage, and immutable convention.

"*We look up with reſpect to nobility.*" No! Britons acknowledge no other diſtinction between man and man than that, which ariſes from a pre-eminence in integrity in the firſt place, and ability in the ſecond. But a nobleman, who ſlights the gewgaws, ſtars, and garters, and extrinſic honours and titles, as detracting from his intrinſic importance

as

as a man, and who acts well his part in public and private life, they "*respect*," but not more than any other good man, who is not so *childishly* distinguished from his fellow-men. As to those noble courtiers, who are a mere, "telluris inutile pondus," who may say of themselves,

"Nos numerus sumus et fruges consumere nati,"

who fatten on the spoils of the public as placemen and pensioners, or who live in the habitual practice of vice, they are animals so far from meriting "*respect*," that they are below the notice of a British cobler or tinker, who, if he be a virtuous honest man, is greatly their superior.

Page 134. The "*consecrated revenue of our eccleſi-*
"*astical establishment*" is an expression, which would well convey the superstitious ideas of a man educated within the collegiate walls of the order of Jesuits; but is brought forward by you in an age and a country too enlightened to be disposed to relish such holy cant and pious imposition. *We*, to adopt your plural pronoun primitive, are more inclined to substitute in lieu of the epithet "*consecrated*," that of *desecrated*, or, even *execrated* revenue, when we reflect on the not very honourable means, by which such revenue was originally acquired.

Page 135. Your "*hot spirit furiously boiling in*
"*France, drawn out of the alembic of hell*," is a figurative mode of expression so *superlatively delicate*, so *super-refinedly polite*, that it constitutes you ex pede Herculem, or *every inch a gentleman*. Where is the

vile calumniator, who, in deſpight of this rare incon-teſtible evidence to the contrary, dares deny Mr. Burke to be the accompliſhed gentleman?

Page 136. As you are already in poſſeſſion of my thoughts and hints on the ſubject of national eſtabliſhments in religion, and of the interference of the civil magiſtrates with matters merely religious, I ſhall wave diſcuſſing the particular topic of "*our church* "*eſtabliſhment*," and leave you ſprawling at your length under the feet of your victorious antagoniſt Dr. Prieſtley, and bawling for mitred aſſiſtance to enable you to riſe. I will ſpare the favourite "*fungus, ſloth, glutton,* "*and ſtone roof*," which the perſecuted Doctor is ſo zealous to "extirpate, deſtroy, kill and remove." See Prieſtley's Letters to Burke.—By the bye, as you are fond of tropes and metaphors, do you admire theſe his compariſons of a civil eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, if not as ſublime and beautiful, at leaſt as humourous and appoſite?

However, with a curſory remark or two on your reflections on the ſubject of civil eſtabliſhments in religion I cannot diſpenſe. At page 150, you repreſent our "*clergy*," our "*church*," independent, and add, "*They, the people of England, tremble for their* "*liberty, from the influence of a clergy dependant on the* "*crown*," as though the clergy were not now dependant on the crown, and more ſo, than if the French "*project*" were adopted of turning them "*into eccle-*"*ſiaſtical penſioners of ſtate.*" This, as it was accompanied with the deſtruction of the hierarchy,

has

has deprived them of all power and influence, ſave what ariſes from the legiſlative function of ſuch of the clerical corps, as are elected members of the National Aſſembly. Are not our clergy, both immediately and mediately, dependant on the crown, in conſequence of the diſpoſal of the primary and ſubordinate church dignities, and a very large proportion of church benefices, being inveſted in the crown and the bench of biſhops? *But, ſans doute, the people need not "tremble for their liberty" on this account, becauſe the attachment of the lords ſpiritual to the liberty of the people is ſo notorious, that the holy men are, to a man, found in oppoſition to the miniſter of the day, when his views be hoſtile to national liberty. Inſtead of one 'he' Abdiel, among the faithleſs faithful only, they are all Abdiels; and thoſe of the clergy, who are dependant on their dioceſans for prefermemt, follow with emulous ardour their venerable example of diſintereſted patriotiſm.*

You proceed, "*they, the people of England, tremble "for the public tranquillity from the diſorders of a "factious clergy, if it were made to depend on any other "than the crown.*" Suppoſe your "*any other*" were the election of the people, I cannot diſcern, that, if the people were to chuſe their own miniſters in religion, ſuch clergy ſo dependant would become "*factious*," and, if not factious, no diſorders could ariſe, and conſequently, the people would have no cauſe to "*tremble for the public tranquillity.*" The whole tenor of the hiſtory of the firſt ages of the church

church is in point, to prove, that ſuch popular elections were peaceably conducted, and the preſent elective practice of the diſſenters from the eſtabliſhment corroborates the fact. It was not till the 4th century, when the Emperor Conſtantine thruſt the world into the church, and, by annexing temporal and exceſſive emoluments to ſpiritual offices, made them the objects of a rapacious ambition, that public tranquillity was diſturbed. And how irritable, how eaſily provoked your "*independent church*" of England may be to diſturb the public tranquillity, no other convincing teſtimony is wanted, than the recent experience of the Birmingham riots, perpetrated by an high- church mob, who proceeded to ſuch ſavage acts of conflagration of the property, and of demolition of the houſes and religious edifices of the unoffending body of Unitarian Diſſenters, as would have cauſed the lately departed Cherokee chiefs to bluſh for ſhame through the tawney tincture of their ſkins.

You are rather too confident, when, at page 156, you aſſert, that "*the Commons of Great Britain, in "the national emergencies, will never ſeek their re-"ſource from the confiſcation of the eſtates of the church.* But, if the Houſe of Commons will never "*ſeek*" ſuch "*reſource*," the people at large, of whom numerous individuals poſſeſs more or leſs funded property, which is dear to them as landed property to others, and ought to be equally inviolable, may not only "*ſeek*," but demand, this "*reſource*," as ſoon as the national

tional emergency of the long-impending national bankruptcy ſhall arrive. The ruinous ſyſtem of finance in providing for the ſupplies, by borrowing money from the public to the preſent enormous extent of near 300 millions, (with the certainty of an increaſe of the debt in the event of war) and in diſcharging the intereſt by oppreſſing the people with heavily accumulated taxation, threatens to bring forward this national emergency, at no diſtant period. The cord is extended to its utmoſt length, and every attempt to ſtretch it farther will break it. You may indeed alledge, that the preſent miniſter has paid off upwards of ſeven millions of the funded debt. I do not ſeek to diſparage him, but 'fiat juſtitia, ruat cœlum,' till it can be proved, that the unfunded debt, particularly in the article of Exchequer-bills, is not proportionally increaſed, ſuch payment can hardly be ſaid to be more than ideal and nominal. When therefore the awful criſis of a final period to public credit arrives, in conſequence of the ne plus ultra of taxation, it requires not immediate divine inſpiration to vaticinate, but merely human foreſight to prognoſticate, that thoſe creditors of the ſtate, the ſtock holders, trembling for the loſs of their property, and the already ſufficiently burthened public, equally dreading the cruſhing weight of freſh impoſts, may, guided by the powerful inſtinct of ſelf-preſervation, unite in inſiſting on "*the confiſcation* "*of the eſtates of the church*," after making a ſuitable life-proviſion for the preſent ſtate-clergy. The

confiſcation

confiſcation may probably be accompanied with the ſeizure of thoſe other eſtates in mortmain, corporation-lands and charity-lands, which laſt I ſuppoſe you mean by "*the eſtates of the poor.*"

This firm union of intereſts may alſo be productive of much-wanted radical reforms in parliamentary and eccleſiaſtical concerns, followed up with the accompliſhment of plans of public utility, reſpecting a permanent proviſion for the poor, the entire abolition of the ſlave-trade, ſo juſtly offenſive to God and man, and the *gradual* emancipation of the negroes in the Weſt-Indies; gradual, I repeat, for it would be folly in the extreme to truſt them with that badge of liberty, the uſe of fire-arms, till by means of moral inſtruction, the ſanguinary ſpirit of revenge be eradicated from their hearts, and the Chriſtian virtue and duty of forgiveneſs planted in its ſtead.

"*The confiſcation*" you ſtigmatize as "*ſacrilege,*" and, no doubt, in perfect congruity with your ideas, and the principles in which you have been educated. But an enlightened laity, now as knowing as the clergy, may honour "*the confiſca-*" "*tion*" with the appellation of a "*juſt reſumption*" of national property, wheedled from them by prieſtcraft, or wreſted from them by the terror of church excommunication, in an age of popular barbariſm and ignorance. In truth, the light of increaſing knowledge reſpecting equal political liberty, if proper inſtructors can be found to diffuſe it among the lower ranks, would prove of itſelf ſufficient, without

out the unfortunate aid of national diſtreſs, to bring on the fall of civil eſtabliſhments in religion. But, at preſent, the ignorance of the common people in this kingdom is ſo great, that there is great reaſon to ſuppoſe, if the mob, at the time of the Birmingham riots, had accidentally heard a parrot prating diſreſpectfully of the church of England, pretty Poll's beautiful plumage would not have ſaved her from the premature, violent death of martyrdom. One mock-bird of the ſame ſpecies, the diurnal prints relate, has been lately accuſed, tried, and burnt in Spain for hereſy and blaſphemy, in making free with the church of Rome, and its ſpiritual head, by the holy Fathers of the Inquiſition, amidſt the rejoicings and acclamations of a bigotted, fanatical, unlettered multitude. Nay, it is farther added, her companion, a capering, chattering monkey, man's caricature and mimic, has ſhared the ſame fate, as an accomplice in her guilt, merely for ſuch geſticulations as were interpreted to be ſignificant of his joyful aſſent to the imprudent language of the feathered principal.

Page 187. Diveſt yourſelf of all partiality to ſelf, a taſk, which wiſer men than you and I find it difficult to perform; peruſe this, your Letter of extraordinary Reflections, from beginning to end, and interrogate yourſelf, whether you rank among thoſe men of "*ſteady independent minds*," who, "*when they have an object of ſo ſerious a concern to* "*mankind as government under their contemplation,*

diſdain

" *diſdain to aſſume the part of ſatiriſts and declaimers?*" If you cannot reſolve this queſtion in the affirmative, " de te fabula narratur."

Page 189, I cannot agree with you that, " *the* " *ſtate of population of any country,*" is " *not the leaſt* " *certain among the ſtandards,*" or criteria of a mild or " *miſchievous government*" The propenſity to the propagation of the ſpecies is, by the all-wiſe and good Author of nature, ſo ſtrongly implanted in both ſexes, that to eradicate it exceeds the power of the moſt deſpotic of governments. Therefore the flouriſhing ſtate of population in France, under the old monarchy, is no proof of its beneficial effects. To have diſpeopled France, it would have been neceſſary for its " *miſchievous government*' to have moſt ſavagely ordered an armed executioner, at the parturition of every woman, to ſend an infant out of, as ſoon as an accoucheur, or accoucheuſe, had brought it into, the world. As the imperial monſters, Tiberius and Caligula, Nero and Domitian, did not venture to proceed to this moſt atrocious, and hitherto unpractiſed ſpecies of depopulation, Roman population increaſed even under their execrable governments.

Page 192, 193. You are equally unfortunate in adducing a large " *amount*" of circulating " *coin*" in France, as an inconteſtible proof of the equity of its government. A ſanguinary victor may be enriched with the ſpoils of a conquered people, with the capture of an immenſe pecuniary treaſure, and yet the enſlaved people of his own country groan

and

and languiſh in the miſerable ſtate of extreme impoveriſhment. The old, abſolute monarchy of France, abetted by its ariſtocracy and hierarchy, did certainly promote the improvement of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, from this principle of policy, that, without them, they would want the means of gratifying their own luxurious expenſive ſtyle of living. But the people at large, the induſtrious bees, plundered of their hives by the ſwarms of drones and hornets iſſuing from theſe three deſtruſtive neſts, enjoyed but a very ſmall portion of the honeyed fruits of their labours.

Page 204. I ſhall not enter on the merits or demerits of the French Nobleſſe; I ſhall not contraſt your panegyric of the aboliſhed order, which repreſents them "*as men of an high ſpirit, and reaſonably tinctured with literature,*" with the cenſure of them by the anonymous author of "Short Obſervations on your Reflections," who, according to an extract in the Monthly Review, volume 4. page 94, "conſiders them in general, as an indolent, enervated, diſſolute, race of men." But I cannot think with you, page 205, that "*Nobility is a graceful ornament to the civil order,*" or "*the Corinthian capital of poliſhed ſociety.*" I regard it rather as an excreſcence, a fungus in the body politic, and more as a wart, which, on the application of a proper cauſtic, may be with ſafety corroded, than a wen, which the operation of the knife cannot extirpate, without hazarding an effuſion of blood, which may terminate in a loſs of life. You aſſert,

"*he*

" *he feels no ennobling principle who wiſhes to level all* " *the artificial inſtitutions.*" I, on the contrary, maintain, that he is deſtitute of this principle, who would wiſh to debaſe a man into a baby, tricked out with ſtars and ribbons, rather than elevate him into his rank as a man. He is truly noble, who approves of aboliſhing all external, fanciful diſtinctions, as ſerving no other end than to fill one ſet of men with pride, inſolence, and a contempt of their fellow-men. He is truly noble, who acknowledges no other ſuperiority of man to man, than what ariſes from preeminence in integrity. If any man have deſerved well of his country in arts, or in arms, while that grand error in government, war, prevails, let him be contented with the true reſpect, which will be paid him by a diſcerning people; and not ſeek to blazon his merit by an oſtentatious badge on his coat, or to diſplay it in the periſhing titles of falſe honour. I am an advocate for an indiſcriminate elevation of all men in the eſtabliſhment of their natural equalization as men; and, to purſue your architectural alluſion, prefer to the gaudy acanthus of your " *Corinthian capital*," the beautiful elegance of the Ionic volute, or the neat Quakeriſh ſimplicity of the Tuſcan or Doric order.

CHAPTER

CHAPTER XIII.

Mr. Burke's character of the French clergy contraſted with that of one of his Anſwerers.—The Examiner ſuggeſts a method of turning the lands of the Gallican church to better account than by the ſale of them.—Maintained, againſt Mr. Burke, that the decorations of churches are an expenditure, leſs worthy of a wiſe man than ribbands, laces, and national cockades.—Intimation of the exemplification of the juſtneſs of Mr. Burke's remark, that eloquence and wiſdom are not inſeparable companions.—Defects in the organization of the legiſlative branch of the new French conſtitution, particularly in the affair of repreſentation.—Hints for ſupplying theſe defects, by making the repreſentation and eligibility into the National Aſſembly immediate, equal, and univerſal; and the election annual.—The conſtituent aſſembly, by their moderation and generoſity, avert the neceſſity of a change in the executive power, which the King by his flight might have incurred.—A hint for a new formation of the executive power, in the caſe of the king's future abdication of the crown.---The king accepts the new conſtitution, and declares his acceptance to foreign courts.---The Examiner exhorts kings to voluntarily grant that equal liberty, which has at laſt been ceded by the French King.---A word in praiſe of the King of Poland.---Juſtification of the excluſion of miniſters of ſtate from the national councils, and of the National Aſſembly's deprivation of the Kings perogative of war.---The Examiner juſtifies the National Aſſembly in their neglect of M. Neckar, on account of his attempt to introduce miniſters of ſtate into their legiſlative body.---Examination of Mr. Burke's ſentiments on the plan of judicature formed by the National Aſſembly.---Improvements and correctives of errors in the ſaid plan ſuggeſted.

PAGES 214, 215. I am not poſſeſſed of the means to procure ſatisfactory information, whether your account of "*the*" French "*clergy in* "*general*," as "*perſons of moderate minds and deco-* "*rous manners*," be founded in truth. That it is ſo founded, Chriſtian charity inſtructs me to hope, as alſo to believe, that "*the higher clergy, almoſt all of* "*them perſons of noble birth, by no means diſgrace* "*their profeſſion by ignorance*," but are "*liberal and* "*open, neither inſolent, nor ſervile.*" However, your favourable repreſentation is not in uniſon with a leſs pleaſing deſcription given of the French clergy by the aforeſaid author of the "Short Obſervations;" and there is not the ſhadow of a reaſon to ſuſpect that it was dictated by a miſchievous ſpirit of rancour and malignity, or by any other motive than that of a ſtrict regard to truth. According to an extract from theſe Obſervations in the Monthly Review, Vol. iv, page 94, "The clergy of the lower "rank, he maintains, to be groſsly ſenſual, proud, "and avaricious; while in thoſe of the higher claſs "he ſaw little elſe but the poliſhed manners of a cour- "tier, devoted to the illicit purſuits of amorous li- "bertiniſm." Therefore ſub judice lis eſt;—and the French people are the only competent judges to decide, which one of the two different repreſentations of their Clergy, by two *eye-witneſſes*, from England, be moſt diſtinguiſhed by an adherence to veracity. Poſſibly your *ſight* might be ſomewhat *obſcured* by your

your *viſible* partiality for an eſtabliſhed clergy and hierarchy.

As the total deſtruction of the religious orders was not atchieved without making a proper life-proviſion for their preſent members, and humanely leaving it to the option of the cloiſtered brethren and ſiſters to quit or remain in their cells, the meaſure meets my entire approbation. The aged abbots and abbeſſes, and the more elderly monks and nuns, may (ſuch is the power of long contracted habit over the human mind) be perfectly reconciled, like our ſenior fellows of colleges, to an immured ſolitary life. But it is more than probable, the younger religious of both ſexes have joyfully and thankfully embraced the opportunity of eſcaping from the gloom of the cloiſter, and of exchanging their auſtere vow of celibacy for the more pleaſing bonds of matrimony, in conſequence of their reſtoration to their friends and to civil ſociety, happy to become uſeful members of the community, in the mutual endearing relations of huſbands and wives, of fathers and mothers of families. You indeed, page 232, 233, pronounce "*ſuch corporations raſhly deſtroyed*;" and, in the genuine ſpirit of your chimera-working fancy, ſuppoſe "*any way*" ſhort of an abſolute ſuppreſſion might have been found by "*great ſtateſmen*" to "*convert ſuch a power as exiſted in the wealth, diſcipline, and habits of ſuch corporations, to the great and laſting benefit of their country.*" It is certain, that without a total abolition of the monaſtic inſtitutions, their

wealth could not be appropriated to the ſervice of the ſtate. But I am not ſufficiently acquainted with the peculiar circumſtances of the French nation and their late conſtitutive aſſembly to determine, with any degree of certainty, whether the latter could have found a "*a way of turning the revenue*" of the ſuppreſſed monaſtic orders "*to*" better "*account*" than the mode of ſale they adopted, and which, at page 134, you are pleaſed to ſtile "*the improvident reſource "of a ſpendthrift-ſale.*" I rather think they might, and will ſpecify what occurs to me as a more beneficial mode.

I think then, inſtead of ſelling the church lands, in poſſeſſion as well of the ſecular as of the regular clergy, the Aſſembly would have "*turned*" them "*to*" better "*account*," if they had retained the whole of them in their own hands as a perpetual ſource of ſtate revenue. They might have let them on ſhort leaſes to the beſt bidders, and applied the rents to the gradual liquidation of their national debt, and to the payment of eccleſiaſtical penſions, and of ſuch as they might think proper to allow to thoſe civil officers, whoſe offices they had aboliſhed as altogether unneceſſary.

If indeed they could have ventured to proceed to a total annihilation of their civil eſtabliſhment in religion, and to put ſpiritual concerns on the ſame footing they are among the Diſſenters in England, where the inhabitants of the vicinage elect, and pay their own miniſters, they would have poſſeſſed after

the

the final diſcharge of their debt, and the death of the eccleſiaſtical penſioners, the whole of the ſtate revenue ariſing from the church lands, clear and unincumbered, for the purpoſe of appropriating it ſolely to the neceſſary annual ſupplies of government. It would have formed no inconſiderable part, in our Parliamentary language, of the *ways and means*. Thus too their plan reſpecting church-matters, and their triumph over church power and craft, would have been complete.

Page 239. You aſk, "*Are the decorations of temples an expenditure leſs worthy a wiſe man than ribbands and laces, and national cockades*," &c?—Yes:—"God is a ſpirit, and they who worſhip him, "muſt worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth." Therefore, as a plain building, free from ornament, is better calculated to promote ſpiritual worſhip, than the gorgeous finery of modern churches, a wiſe man will think "*ribbands and laces, and national cockades*" more worthy objects of expenditure than the embelliſhment of temples with pictures, with images, with ſhewy gilt gingerbread altar-pieces, ſurrounded with trumpeting full grown Seraphim, with pretty little winged Cupids, called Cherubim, bo-peeping out of clouds, and tricked out with idolatrous triangular and circular emblems of the Deity, and with *beſtial* ſupporters of royal enſigns armorial. To theſe ſplendid temples, which can have no other tendency than to introduce groſs ſenſual ideas into pure ſpiritual worſhip, a wiſe man prefers a decent unornamented

unornamented place of worſhip for his God, and a plain Communion Table for the celebration of the Supper of his Lord.

But, as a little folly cheers the ſtudious brain, and nonſenſe is, at proper ſeaſons, the beſt philoſophy, a wiſe man will at theſe ſeaſons join in the humourous follies of the multitude, and ſpend a little money on the external finery of "*ribbands and* "*laces.*" French "*national cockades*" he will even deem no unworthy objects of expenditure, becauſe, in the infancy of the French Revolution, the diſplay of a bunch of three ſtriped ribbands on his hat is neceſſary to remind the French people of their happy triumph over the triune confederation of monarchic, ariſtocratic, and hierarchic deſpotiſm.

Page 245, you remark that "*Eloquence may exiſt* "*without a proportionable degree of wiſdom.*" I wonder who exemplifies in his own perſon the acknowledged juſtneſs of this remark.

Page 254, &c. Proceeding to your reflections on the organization of the new legiſlative eſtabliſhment of France, commencing at page 254, I am ready to admit, that the French revolutioniſts ſeem (they will pardon the freedom of a cordial friend to their cauſe) to have erred in the affair of repreſentation. They have ſo departed from ſimplicity in this momentous point, in which it ought to be principally obſerved, that nothing can be more intricate and complex. As their legiſlative conſtitution conſiſts of "*repreſentations on repreſentations, on three diffe-*" *rent baſes,—geometrical, or the baſis of territory,—*

" *arithmetical,*

" *arithmetical, or the baſis of population,—and finan-*
" *cial, or the baſis of contribution*;" and purſued through a trinal ſeries of " *cantons, communes, and* " *departments*," and requiring from the reſpective members the three different " *qualifications*," the amount of " *three days labour—of ten days labour—* " *and of a mark of ſilver*," before it arrives at the election of the real deputies to the National Aſſembly, the legiſlative conſtitution is, in fact, compoſed of a confuſed *ſyſtem* of repreſentation, a point in which the moſt diſtant approach to ſyſtem ſhould have been carefully avoided. By this ſtrange perplexed gradation of repreſentations, the primary aſſembly, or members of the canton, who, page 257, " *elect*" only " *deputies to the commune*," are, in conſequence of the two intermediate aſſemblies of the commune and the department, thrown at ſo great a diſtance from the members of the National Aſſembly, that all connection between the one and the other body, as conſtituent and repreſentative, and all reſponſibility in the latter, are entirely cut off, the members of the department only, elected by the members of the commune, having a voice in the election of deputies to the National Aſſembly.—This ſurely is a great defect in the organization of the legiſlature, neceſſarily accompanied with a ſimilar defect in point of eligibility into the National Aſſembly. I underſtand they have ſince aboliſhed the qualification of property in the electors to the primary aſſemblies. Still they have not only retained, but increaſed it in the electors of the department, in an

important right merely perſonal, and in which property ſhould not interfere at all. In truth, it is much to be lamented, that this reſpectable conſtitutive body ſwerved from their wiſe and juſt principle of the equalization of all men in the formation of the legiſlature. Conſiſtently with this principle, they might, and ought to have reſted the affair of repreſentation on the baſis of population only. The right of ſuffrage in the choice of legiſlators being merely a perſonal right, totally independent of the plus or minus of property, and conſequently the pooreſt man's right equal with the richeſt, *every man* arrived at the age of twenty-one years, at leaſt, ſhould have been inveſted with the full enjoyment and exerciſe of it, inſtanced in an *immediate direct* election of legiſlative deputies, the miniſters of the crown excepted, becauſe they have neceſſarily a pernicious influence in ſuch elections. When with this exception I contend for the inveſtment of every man with this right, I include as well thoſe who are called *aliens*, as native Frenchmen, and for theſe ſolid reaſons.—1ſt, It is high time, in the preſent enlightened ſtate of Chriſtian Europe, that all men, of every nation, ſhould regard each other as friends and brethren, not in word only, but in deed. It is high time they ſhould expunge the ungenerous, unſocial word Alien from their reſpective political vocabularies.---Secondly, It would have argued conſummate wiſdom in the National Aſſembly to act on this liberal idea. By ſuch a conduct, they would have proved the bleſſed agents

agents in the hands of God to put that final period to offenſive war, which they have benevolently adopted as an abſtract principle in their decrees.---The abolition of *alieniſm* would in particular facilitate intercourſe and intermarriage between the individuals of two neighbouring nations, and by cementing them in the cloſe mutual bonds of amity and love, not only deſtroy the ſeeds of future wars in reſpect to themſelves, but lay the foundation for the introduction of univerſal peace throughout Europe and the world at large.---I am ſo warmed, Mr. Burke, with this benevolent enlarged ſcheme of things, that, though no poet, but a mere verſifier, I, as it were, involuntarily break forth into Latin meaſure and Engliſh rhyme:

" Candida mixta *Roſis* ſint ſemper *Lilia* rubris;
" Angliacâ pacem Gallica gente colat."

" In true love's knot fee *roſe* and *lily* blend,
" Emblem of leagues of peace, which ne'er ſhall end
" 'Tween France and England, hoſtile now no more!
" Rivals in arts of peace and virtuous lore!"

This true love's knot, with the device of *Lilia juncta roſis* inſcribed on it, in letters of gold, would form a pretty bagatelle of a ceſtus for the ſlender waiſts, or a bandeau for the fair foreheads of the French and Engliſh ladies.

It is highly reaſonable aliens ſhould be treated as citizens, by extending to them the right of ſuffrage in the immediate election of members of the National

tional Aſſembly, becauſe, duriug their reſidence in France, they contribute to the ſupport of its government, in the payment of taxes, and are amenable to its laws.

Admitting then immediate univerſal repreſentation, aliens included, and miniſters excluded, I would have recommended to the National Aſſembly the meaſure of equalizing this univerſality of repreſentation in the following manner:—Let us ſuppoſe, for argument's ſake, that France contains twelve millions of men of age, this population may be ſo equally diſtributed as to give ten thouſand electors to the choice of a ſingle deputy to the National Aſſembly, and conſequently twelve hundred deputies to twelve millions of electors. This large body of electors would be an excellent preſervative againſt bribery and influence of every kind in the election; but, as additional *barriers* againſt the practice of them, all candidateſhip, nomination of candidates, and canvaſs for voters, ſhould be expreſsly prohibited, and ſevere penalties inflicted on all who ſhall be convicted of bribing, or being bribed, of influencing or being influenced, in their votes. The moſt proper penalty ſeems to be forfeiture of the rights of ſuffrage, election, and eligibility for the ſpace of three years, *if not* for a longer term. With reſpect to the right of eligibility into the National Aſſembly, that is a right founded on the natural equality of all men equally with the right of ſuffrage or repreſentation, and therefore

eligibility

eligibility, or a chance to be elected a deputy of the aſſembly, ſhould be extended to every man of age, indiſcriminately, the miniſters of the crown excepted, without requiring the ſenſeleſs qualification of property. Thus would the integrity and ability of the whole collective body of the people be gathered into one central point, and the choice of the people in their ſeveral provinces, divided into diſtricts, each diſtrict comprehending as equal a number of electors as poſſible, fall on men moſt diſtinguiſhed for probity and political ſagacity.

If an alien ſhould perchance poſſeſs a majority of votes on the poll, in any one diſtrict, and conſequently be the elected deputy, it will be becauſe his neighbours, the native French, are of opinion, that he poſſeſſes theſe only neceſſary qualifications for legiſlation in greater perfection than any one of themſelves; and integrity and ability cannot but bear the ſway againſt mere wealth and property in elections of deputies to the National Aſſembly, if to the univerſality and equality of repreſentation and eligibility, except as before excepted, to the prohibition of candidateſhip and canvas, and to the infliction of the ſaid ſevere penalties againſt bribery and corruption, were to be added a merely annual duration of the National Aſſembly, inſtead of biennial, as now eſtabliſhed. The power of legiſlating for the welfare of twenty-five millions of people, is a truſt too important to be delegated with ſafety to any one ſet of men for a longer time than one year. When the

deputies

deputies of the National Aſſembly ſink into the maſs of the people, at the end of a ſingle ſeſſion, and according to the preſent wiſe regulation, are incapacitated for re-election before the expiration of three years, all temptations to bribery and to become unfaithful to their truſt, would be effectually precluded. But to admit the poſſibility of an improbability, if, in the ſhort ſpace of a year, the National Aſſembly ſhould be found to legiſlate to the injury, inſtead of the benefit of the community, the people ought to exert their right of remonſtrating againſt the proceedings of the Aſſembly; and, if they proved refractory, of diſſolving them, and inſiſting on a freſh election before the expiration of a year.

It is very reaſonable, the deputies ſhould be paid, at leaſt a louis d'or per day each, for their attendance on their legiſlative function.

The ſpirit of the following meaſure I find decreed by the late national conſtitutive aſſembly in the late biennial election of the firſt legiſlative, namely, that the annual election ought to be ſo conducted, as that no man ſhould be declared the elected deputy, who did not poſſeſs a majority of the whole number of votes on the poll in the diſtrict. Otherwiſe it might ſo happen, that, in conſequence of every man of age being not only an elector, but eligible as a deputy, the election might fall on a man poſſeſſing but a ſmall majority of votes. Now, to obviate this inconvenience, if on caſting up the poll, no man be found to be elected the deputy by a majority of the

the whole number of votes on the poll, let the election be reduced to thoſe few, who poſſeſs the moſt conſiderable numbers of votes, and the electors proceed to poll afreſh at ſuch reduced election. It is very poſſible, that at this reduced election, the object in view may be obtained; but, if not, let the election be farther reduced to thoſe two men only, in whoſe favour the two largeſt numbers of votes appear on the poll, and the electors proceed to poll again, for the third and laſt time, when, in the very nature of things, one of the two muſt be the deputy elected by a majority of the whole number of voters, or the two poſſeſs an equality of votes. In this latter caſe, let the election be finally determined by lot.

To preſerve order, and prevent the tumult, which may ariſe from an aſſemblage of ten thouſand electors in one ſpot, let the electors be accommodated by holding the poll at ten different places, if judged neceſſary; and a thouſand electors poll at each by one hundred at a time.

Being a true friend to the cauſe of the newly-acquired liberty of France, I ſubmit to the unbiaſſed judgment of the French, and of their legiſlative aſſembly to decide, whether or not, the preceding hints of improvement will correct and ſupply what I conceive to be errors and defects in the preſent *complicated* organization of the legiſlative branch of their new free conſtitution. By adopting theſe hints, they will practically adhere to their own excellent

ſimple

ſimple principle of equalization, and by giving to the poor their due, an equal weight with the rich in the ſcale of government, reſemble their good Creator, who is the impartial Creator of both, and "careth "alike for the ſmall and the great."

Page 288. With reſpect to "*the formation of the* "*executive power*," the conſtituent National Aſſembly enjoyed, in conſequence of the king's abdication of the crown by his flight, an opportunity to form it anew. Happily, by their diſcreet conduct, they have not availed themſelves of it. But, if they had been driven by indiſpenſible neceſſity to frame a new executive government, much as I approve of a *democratic legiſlative*, I could not have recommended a *republican executive* power. It would have been inconvenient, inefficient, miſchievous. I would, in that caſe, have rather adviſed the Aſſembly to have veſted the executive province in an *annually-elected* king, choſen in ſtrict conformity to their juſt and excellent political principle, the natural equality of all men, by the free, fair, full voice of the people at large, from among the numerous individuals of their whole collective body, and with the ſame proviſions againſt electioneering influence, which I have ſuggeſted in the election of the Legiſlative Aſſembly. I would alſo, in that caſe, have urged the propriety of incapacitating the individual, who had been once elected *annual* king, for *re-election* to the ſaid high function, throughout the whole courſe of his life. Thus the chief magiſtracy would not have been an object of rapacious worldly ambition,

and

and no one individual, or family, would have been able to engroſs the executive power, which he, or they, might have been always ready and fertile in expedients to abuſe. But the conſtituent aſſembly, inſtead of pleading the neceſſity of ridding the nation of an hereditary crown, as a dangerous thing, have, much to their honour, exhibited a rare ſpecimen of forbearance, moderation, and generoſity, in re-inſtating the king in the exerciſe of the executive province, without any other terms, than ſuch of future forfeiture and abdication, as muſt inſure the approbation and applauſe of the diſcerning part of mankind, and to which the national ſecurity, liberty, and happineſs, require a ſtrict adherence.

I hope the king's affectionate attachment to the people, convinced as he muſt be of their partiality for an hereditary crown, when ſtripped of its deſpotic attributes, and aſſured of their perſonal regard for him, will render any future change in the executive unneceſſary. The excellent form indeed, in which his acceptance of the new free conſtitution is drawn, confirms my hopes, and is a pleaſing preſage of the ſincerity of his acceptance, as is alſo his declaration to foreign courts of his unconditional, unreſerved acceptance of it, and his ready concurrence with the legiſlative aſſembly, to repel the hoſtile machinations of his brothers.

By this wiſe conduct of a mild king, the degraded, but ſelf-expatriated ariſtocrats and hierarchs are defeated in their hopes, that the king would be ſo unwiſe as to liſten to their inſidious ſelfiſh counſels,

cabals

cabals, and plots, for the revival of their united oppreſſive deſpotiſm, under colour of reſtoring the old monarchy in all its plenitude of power. If the king's brothers and the princes of the blood could but diſcern their own true intereſt, they would not heſitate to return to their king and country, and to exhort their adherents to embrace with joy the generous general amneſtry decreed by the late conſtituent aſſembly.

Moſt cordially doI felicitate the French, and their firſt legiſlative aſſembly, that light is not merely reſtored to the "darkened ſun and moon" in the political hemiſphere of France, but that theſe luminaries, the King and Queen, which ſhone before, with the partial luſtre of dazzling rays on court-favourites, and temporal and ſpiritual lords only, now illuminate and gild their whole horizon, diffuſing an univerſal, undiminiſhed blaze of equal ſteady ſplendour over twenty or thirty millions of people. "The ſtars" indeed, the nobles and lordly eccleſiaſtics, "are fallen from" the political "heaven," and may they never riſe again! In their fall, not men, but "the names of men," babyiſh titles and diſtinctions are deſtroyed. But "the powers of" their heaven, ſo lately "ſhaken," are now firmly reſettled; the *legiſlative* power being excluſively veſted, as it ought to be, in the deputies of the people, the *judicial* confined to a ſeparate number of individuals, and the king reinſtated in the *executive*, ſo judiciouſly modified, regulated and reſtrained, as to be in a degree

degree *omnipotent* in its exerciſe for every wiſe purpoſe conducive to national utility, liberty, and happineſs, and *impotent* only with reſpect to miſchief. In ſhort, Mr. Burke, I now regard France as the firſt of nations, enjoying equal impartial liberty in greater perfection than any other people throughout the whole known world.

"Be wiſe now therefore, O ye kings!" repent of your crimes in ſeeking to oppreſs and extirpate the human race by your mutual wars, the fatal effects of your ambition or caprice;—conſult your own true intereſt, and that of the people, which are invariably one and the ſame; and, inſtead of aſſiſting the ſelf-exiled inteſtine enemies of the free political conſtitution of their countrymen to ſubvert it, reform your reſpective governments on ſimilar moral principles.

Why ſhould the King of Poland be the only one among crowned heads to accompliſh a political reform, which, though not ſo complete as might be wiſhed, yet, as it gives ſome degree of weight to the peaſantry in the ſcale of government, reflects immortal honour on the royal philanthropiſt? Why ſhould he become the only "nurſing father," and his queen the only "nurſing mother," of their children, the people? His illuſtrious example ſurely merits your imitation and improvement. Is it not more for your true glory and intereſt to voluntarily grant, with a good grace, that equal liberty, which, by dint of national perſeverance has at length been

ceded by the king of the French, but once obtained, eſtabliſhes his own happineſs, by ſecuring his throne on the only ſolid baſis, the affections of the people? But, alas! Kings will not be wiſe; the French people therefore muſt, in their collective wiſdom, oppoſe to the unprovoked league of the northern powers of the continent againſt them, the offer of a ſettlement on the waſte lands of their country, with the complete enjoyment of political, civil, and religious liberty, to the privates of the confederate armies deſigned to carry ſlaughter and devaſtation through much injured France, and return the officers with diſgrace to their reſpective ſovereigns of the orders of Saint Michael, the Spread Eagle, the Polar Star, and the Elephant. This alternative indeed is left; as they know the hoſtile machinations of the ſaid powers againſt them, to anticipate them by a ſpirited invaſion of their reſpective kingdoms, leaving a ſufficient number of armed citizens at home for national defence.

Page 293, "*The miniſters of ſtate in France are "the only perſons in that country, who are incapable of "a ſhare in the national councils*;" and very wiſely ſo. There is not one decree of the national conſtitutive aſſembly, which more fully evinces the ſoundneſs of their political ſagacity than that which excludes the miniſters of ſtate from a participation of the legiſlative function. If they were not incapacitated for election, as members of the national legiſlative aſſembly, but the legiſlative and executive powers, which

which ought ever to be kept diſtinct and ſeparate, were to be confounded together in the perſons of French miniſters of ſtate, they would, by a plentiful diſtribution of lucrative offices and ſinecures among the other members, acquire ſuch influence over their votes, as to ſubject them to their deſpotic controul. The union of theſe two powers of government in the ſame individual, or individuals, be they few or many, conſtitutes the very eſſence of deſpotiſm. The will of the monarch in the perſon of the miniſter would, but for this wiſe precaution, have ſtill continued to be the only law in France; and ſalus populi, which ought to be ſuprema lex, would, as heretofore, have been ſacrificed to royal pleaſure and caprice. Happily miniſters are now in *that* country really "*reſponſible*" for their conduct to the legiſlative delegates of the people.

Page 294, With equal wiſdom have the conſtituent aſſembly deprived their king of "*the prerogative of war.*" Under the old monarchy, the blood and treaſure of 25 or 30 millions of people lay at the mercy of one man; and the quantity of the one ſhed, and of the other ſquandered in foreign wars, evince the free exerciſe of the baneful prerogative.

Page 298, When "*Monſieur Neckar*" was reinſtated in his financial capacity, at the earneſt ſolicitation of the conſtituent Aſſembly, they regarded him as a friend to the Revolution, but, ſoon diſcovering his intrigues for thruſting "*miniſters of ſtate*" into

their legiſlative body, they changed their opinion of him for one leſs favourable, but more juſt, very properly withdrew their confidence in him, and ſuffered him to *ſlink* back into his former obſcurity of voluntary exile. Not therefore, as this ex-miniſter aſſerts in his ſelf-important work, "Sur l' Adminiſtration de Monſieur Neckar," 'les chefs du parti 'dominant prirent la reſolution formelle de me '*depopulariſer*,' but he took true pains to make himſelf unpopular.

There may be errors "*in the plan of judicature*, "*formed by the national conſtituent aſſembly*," but the good ſenſe of the firſt legiſlative aſſembly will apply the neceſſary correctives and improvements, as they advance in judicial knowledge.

I cannot pronounce "*the utter abolition of the Parliaments*" an error. As a main branch of their office was to regiſter the edicts of the crown, the purpoſe of their inſtitution in this particular became unneceſſary, when the legiſlative power of the crown was ſuperſeded.

Let Britons be ever on the watch, that their own Parliament does not betray their important legiſlative truſt, and dwindle into an aſſembly holden merely for the trifling, or rather miſchievous purpoſe, of enrolling the mandates of adminiſtration.

Page 299, I join you in diſapprobation of the appointment of "*elective temporary judges*." I think they ſhould be nominated by the king, and paid by the people; and that their offices, inſtead of being

of

of temporary "*ſexennial*" duration, or durante bene placito, ſhould be holden for life, or quamdiu ſe bene geſſerint. In this caſe the judges, being independent, are not liable to corruption. But "*local* "*judges*" I prefer to our *circuitous* judges, as being a meaſure productive of leſs expence. Beſides, being reſident on the ſpot where his tribunal is erected, a judge becomes acquainted with the ſtate of the vicinage, of which he ought not to be ignorant.

Page 301, I agree with you in the "*abſurdity of* "*veſting the power of remonſtrance upon all the decrees* "*of the National Aſſembly in the principal executive* "*officer.*" In the conſtituent body only, the people at large, as I before remarked, ought this power to be lodged.

Pages 300—303. I am happy to acknowledge a perfect coincidence between us reſpecting the impolicy of "*exempting the adminiſtrative bodies from* "*the juriſdiction of the temporary ſexennial judica-* "*tories,*" which ought to be ſubject to them, on the impeachment of the National Aſſemby for maladminiſtration.

The Aſſembly, in their wiſe eſtabliſhment of the right of trial by jury, have fully obviated your objection of "*leaving much to the diſcretion of the judge,*" in their promiſed formation "*of a body of law, ſhort,* "*ſimple, clear.*" It cannot be too little complex, and to be clear, it ſhould be equally free from unneceſſary ambages verborum, and from that dearth,

that conciſe niggardlineſs of expreſſion, which deſtroys perſpicuity.—" Dum brevis eſſe laboro, ob-" ſcurus fio."

I truſt the National Aſſembly will extend the right of trial by jury as well to civil as to criminal cauſes. If their code of law be ſufficiently ſhort, ſimple, and clear, I ſhould hope the profeſſions of advocates and attornies might be aboliſhed. In criminal caſes, " by the mouth of two or three witneſſes," in the language of ſcripture, " every word " ſhall be eſtabliſhed;" and in civil ſuits recourſe may be had to written evidence. Therefore the employment of wordy advocates involves proſecutor and culprit, plaintiff and defendant, in unneceſſary expenſes.

The infliction of capital puniſhments, ſo frequent in England in caſes of felony, Mr. Jallert in his humane little treatiſe, intitled " Sur la peine de " mort," &c. has done much to convince me that it is not juſtifiable even in the caſe of murther.

Whether in civil cauſes an appeal ſhould lie from the verdict of a jury, I am incompetent to decide; but incline to the opinion of a ſenſible young barriſter of my acquaintance, that, if any appeal be admitted it ſhould be from the verdict of one jury to that of another. It remains to be ſeen whether the court of appeal, which the National Aſſembly has inſtituted, will anſwer the purpoſe.

The torture of the rack, not to inſiſt on its inefficiency, as a mode of extorting truth, and on the injuſtice of compelling a man to accuſe himſelf, is a ſpecies of puniſhment diſgraceful to an humane, liberal, and poliſhed people.

CHAPTER XIV.

Examination of Mr. Burke's Reflections on the military eſtabliſhment of the National Aſſembly.—The Examiner, in oppoſition to Mr. Burke, approves of the National Aſſembly's proceedings in eſtabliſhing ſocial habits between the army and the people.—The Examiner ſubmits to the National Aſſembly an outline of military arrangements conſiſting of the conſolidation of the national and municipal armies, forming, jointly with the people at large, an univerſal national militia of armed citizens.—Examination of Mr. Burke's Reflections on the organization of the French financial eſtabliſhment.—His extraordinary aſſertion that the revenue of the ſtate is the ſtate, combated and expoſed.—Mr. Burke's poſition, that the proſperity and improvement of nations generally increaſe with the increaſe of their revenues, contradicted by experience.—Improvements in French finance reſpecting reſources and ſavings, to be drawn from proper eccleſiaſtic, military, colonial, commercial, and naval arrangements, together with ſuch as relate to a proviſion for the poor &c.—Concluſion of the Examination of Mr. Burke's Reflections.—They tend, contrary to his intent, to accelerate that bleſſed event, a radical Parliamentary reform in Britain, which the French Revolution is calculated to produce.—Curious anecdote conſequent on the publication of the Examiner's "Political Reformation on a large Scale," &c.—Archbiſhop Laud and Biſhop Williams, Mr. Burke, and his Examiner.—Port, Tokay, and Burgundy.

PAGE 327, The military eſtabliſhment of the National Aſſembly, conſiſting of two armies, "*the municipal and the national*," appears to me an injudicious contrivance, though perhaps unavoidable at

at the commencement of the revolution. I intend to preſent the French people and their National Aſſembly with an outline of military arrangements, in my judgment, more ſimple and unexceptionable, and in the final event, not only not calling for a national expenditure, but productive of a ſource of national revenue, leaving it to their wiſdom to adopt or reject it.

Page 310, I do not apprehend thoſe bad conſequences which you ſuppoſe will ariſe from "*the circular letters of the King, ordering and encouraging the ſeveral corps*" of the national army, "*to join themſelves with the clubs and confederacies in the ſeveral municipalities, and mix with them,*" with their fellow citizens at large, and with the municipal army. It is high time to deſtroy, in every country, the wicked policy of detaching the ſoldier from the citizen, to confer the rights of citizenſhip on the ſoldier, and to promote a cordial union, and the eſtabliſhment of ſocial habits between him and the collective body of the people; in ſhort, to popularize the army, and to arm the people, and blend both in one harmonious community of equal and free citizens.

Pages 310, 311. Military authority, diſcipline, and ſubordination between the officers and privates, may ſurely be maintained without the ſevere neceſſity of converting the free agency of the latter into the involuntary puppet-like motion of "*mere inſtruments,*" and machines, "*which*" you ſay,

"*Monſieur*

"*Monſieur de la Tour du Pin juſtly obſerves, the "nature of things always requires an army to be.*" But I hope you are not aware of the miſchievous conſequence of this *mechanical* doctrine, as inſtead of "*ſoftening the ferocity of the minds*" of the common ſoldiery, it would "*fit them for the character of mere*" paſſive "*inſtruments*" to dragoon the people into a compliance with the arbitrary mandates of a deſpotic government, or of a free government haſtening with rapid ſtrides towards deſpotiſm. My grand outline of military arrangements would be the conſolidation of the two armies into one, forming jointly with the people at large, from ſixteen to ſixty years of age, one general militia of armed citizens. To the privates ſhould be allotted, in lieu of their preſent pay, three acres of waſte land each, to cultivate, on condition of inſtructing the reſt of the people of the ages aforeſaid in the uſe of arms, as alſo to the non-commiſſioned officers on the ſame terms, with the allowance of their additional pay as ſuch for life. This is a meaſure more feaſible ſince the deſtruction of ſeigneural privileges. They ſhould be ſupplied at firſt with a little live ſtock, neceſſary ſeeds, and implements of huſbandry, at the public expence; and at the end of three years, when it might be ſuppoſed they had by their labour brought their reſpective portions of land into heart, they ſhould be required to re-imburſe the public, by little and little, out of their annual profits from the produce of the ſoil.

When

When this reimburſement is effected, they ſhould pay a ſmall rent to government for ever. Theſe lands ſhould be made unalienable, by ſale or mortgage, and hereditary in their families by equal portions among all the children, thus deſtroying the barbarous Norman claim of primogeniture, which in the caſe of landed property beggars all but the firſt born ſon, and eſtabliſhes the unjuſt preference of males to females. A proportion only of the annual produce to be ſubjected to ſeizure for any debts they may contract. To the preſent commiſſioned officers ſhould be allowed the amount of their pay for life; and, as they and the non-commiſſioned officers drop off by death, the privates ſhould annually elect out of their own body, their own officers, who ſhould be required to act as ſuch without pay.

I proceed now to your reflections on the organization of the French financial eſtabliſhment. At page 328, I find this extraordinary aſſertion, "*The "revenue of the ſtate is the ſtate,*" or the grand leading object of government. That it is made ſo by moſt of the governments of Europe is a fact too ſenſibly experienced to be denied; but that it ought not to be ſo, is an unqueſtionable truth.—When men enter into civil ſociety, their chief, nay ſole point in view, is their own general happineſs, and therefore this happineſs ought to be the primary and principal object of government. Not "*the re-*"*venue*" then, but the happineſs "*of the ſtate, is the*"*ſtate.*"

"*ſtate.*" I admit, this happineſs cannot be obtained without the public payment of a neceſſary revenue; but we experimentally feel on this our little inſular ſpot, which, when compared with the extenſive kingdom of France, is but as a mole-hill to a mountain, that the due collection of an ample national revenue is very conſiſtent with the oppreſſion and miſery of the people, who groan under the accumulated weight of taxes, multiplied almoſt to infinity. It is not true therefore, page 330, that "*the proſperity and improvement of nations, has generally increaſed with the increaſe of their revenues,*" or (page 329) that, "*from revenue, magnanimity, liberality, beneficence, fortitude, providence, and the tutelary protection of all good arts, derive their food.*" On the contrary, from revenue a numerous hoſt of inſatiable Court-dependants draw the ſupport of their avarice and luxury, of their rapacity and diſſipation, two extremes, which ſeldom fail to meet in the ſame individual, at once "alieni appetens, ſui profuſus."

Now we are on the ſubject of French finance and revenue, I cannot forbear repeatedly wiſhing, that the lands of the church had not been ſold, however properly applied the produce of the ſale might be; but retained, and lett by the National Aſſembly on leaſe, to the higheſt bidder, for a longer or a ſhorter term, as in their judgment might ſeem moſt advantageous to the nation. The rents would have proved a never-failing ample ſource of revenue

me, after the incumbrances ariſing from the penſions paid to diſcharged civil officers, and to the ſuppreſſed regular clergy, and from a gradual liquidation of the national debt ſhould ceaſe.

The public finances too would have been recruited with an acceſſion of ſupply from the ſame cauſe, if, as the preſent ſecular or parochial clergy dropped off, the people had been left in their reſpective diſtricts to elect their own miniſters in religion, and to ſupport them by voluntary contribution. But it is well known, the ſectaries denominated Quakers ſubſiſt as a religious community without the payment of a mercenary miniſtry in ſpiritual concerns; and the general exemplarineſs of their moral conduct proves it to be unneceſſary. Thus, that "*conſummation devoutly to be wiſhed*," the entire deſtruction of the whole Gallican church-eſtabliſhment would have been in the final event accompliſhed, the *regular moiety* thereof, as now, by an inſtant abolition, and the *ſecular moiety* by a gradual ſuppreſſion. The happy conſequence to France would have been a diminution in the public expenditure, gradual indeed but certain, from the deaths of eccleſiaſtic penſioners, as well parochial as monaſtic.

The ſeizure alſo of thoſe other eſtates in mortmain, charity-lands, and the lands in poſſeſſion of various corporations, (for I ſuppoſe France is not free from thoſe dead

dead weights on the national ſtrength) would come greatly in aid of the national ſupplies.

From my arrangement of the military eſtabliſhment of the French, wherein I propoſed, that the private and non-commiſſioned officers of the two armies, national and municipal, conſolidated into one, ſhall receive three acres of waſte land each to cultivate, an immediate ſaving in the article of finance, if the National Aſſembly ſhould think proper to adopt my propoſal, would accrue, in the immediate ceſſation of the preſent pay of the privates, and of ſo much of the pay of the non-commiſſioned officers as amounts to the pay of the former. This ſaving would be gradually augmented, and in the final event, to a very large amount, by the ceſſation not merely of the ſmall additional pay of the preſent non-commiſſioned officers, but of the whole very conſiderable pay of the preſent officers in commiſſion, at the reſpective deaths of both. One article of national expenditure indeed would be unavoidably incurred by the propoſed ſupply of the military agriculturiſts with a little live ſtock, neceſſary ſeeds, and implements of huſbandry, to which ſhould be added the erection of ſmall cottages for their habitation. But this would be not only temporary, and once for all, but a gradual reimburſement of the expence, it is propoſed, ſhall be made by the military agriculturiſts after the expiration of three years. Nor is this all; for as ſoon as this expence ſhall be re-paid by them,

it

it is farther recommended, that they ſhall contribute to the ſupport of the public finances by the payment of a ſmall rent for their reſpective portions of land.

I know not the quantity of waſte land in France, but whatever tracts of uncultivated acres ſhall be found to remain after the propoſed diſtribution among the military, I could wiſh ſhould be appropriated to a proviſion for the working poor, in the ſame proportions, and ſubject to the ſame regulations, and conditions of tenure. Thus would the French experience an alleviation of the public burthens in the maintenance of their poor, in whatever mode it may be now conducted, and after a term of years, as in the caſe of the military agriculturiſts, find a ſource of revenue in the receipt of ſmall rents from their little landed eſtates. I would alſo adviſe the erecting of ſchools on the waſte lands for the inſtruction of the infant-poor, and of the children of the military, in religion, morals, and induſtry. In this laſt article, care ſhould be taken to adapt their employments to their reſpective talents and ſex, and to ſave the earnings of the little labourers as premiums of apprenticeſhip at a proper age to ſuitable trades and occupations. Political morality alſo, or inſtruction in the principle that a free government cannot exiſt but when founded on the ſolid baſis of equal liberty, ſhould not be neglected.

I ſhall now beſtow a word on the colonial concerns of the French, and conſider them in a financial point of view. There is ſomething ſo awkward

awkward and troubleſome in admitting deputies into the National Aſſembly, from their diſtant inſular colonies in the Weſt-Indies, Martinique, Guadaloupe, and the French part of Hiſpaniola, &c. that, had I been a member of the National Aſſembly, I ſhould have propoſed to give independence to theſe ſettlements, and to permit them to eſtabliſh their own form of government, recommending to them the new daily-improving French conſtitution for a model, but not obtruding it upon them. The coloniſts might enter into a federal union for their mutual protection, and by the eſtabliſhment of an univerſal militia of armed citizens, in the ſeveral iſlands, from ſixteen to ſixty years of age, after the example recommended to the French, adopt the moſt natural and efficacious mode of ſelf-defence. The French troops now in garriſon at each might be withdrawn, as ſoon as they had inſtructed the coloniſts in the uſe of arms, and in neceſſary military diſcipline. Thus would France experience another grand ſaving article in the buſineſs of finance, and her treaſury be no longer drained by heavy demands on it for the ſupport of expenſive eccleſiaſtic, civil, military, and naval eſtabliſhments in theſe remote appendages to her empire.—No country was ever benefitted by the poſſeſſion of a diſtant territory. Ancient Greece was ruined by her colonies in Aſia; and though a few individuals may acquire immenſe fortunes, yet the taxation neceſſary for the ſupport of a deſtructive mercantile monopoly, and for the defence of

extenſive

extenſive territorial acquiſitions in the Eaſt Indies, contributes to the impoveriſhment of the people of Britain. In ſhort, ſuch detached tranſmarine appendages to a kingdom ſerve only to feed a paltry national pride, and the maintenance of them is more expenſive than valuable to the mother-country. Whatever fiſcal advantages France may more ſuppoſedly than really gain by retaining her foreign dominions, would be amply compenſated by an unreſtricted commercial intercourſe with them in an independent ſtate. A free trade between France and the French Weſt-Indies, opening their reſpective ports to each other, unfettered by taxes on exports and imports, would redound to their mutual proſperity, and give wealth and ſtrength to both.

This naturally leads to a wiſh, that the National Aſſembly would, in aid of the excellent plan of their predeceſſors to put a final period to offenſive war, the bleſt harbinger of the gradual introduction of univerſal peace, propoſe to her new and neighbouring commercial ally, Britain, the enlargement of the preſent treaty of commerce, which reflects ſo much credit on the adminiſtration of Mr. Pitt, into a plan of univerſal commercial liberty between the two nations, not excluding either of the other nations of Europe, or the world at large. This might be accompanied with a mutual agreement reſpecting a ſimple, ſhort, and clear code of commercial law, as the arbiter of all mercantile diſputes between individuals.

viduals. It would be a matter of indifference whether they were brought before a French or a Britiſh tribunal of commerce, becauſe I would propoſe the ſettlement of them by the verdict of a jury compoſed of an equal proportion of French and Britons. So frequent and eaſy is now become the intercourſe between the two people, that neither Paris nor London need be at a loſs to furniſh a jury formed equally of individuals of the two nations. To offer counſel to my own country in the preſent ſtate of her national affairs, I ſhall not preſume, for reaſons which I chuſe rather to leave to conjecture than explain; I ſhall therefore only hazard an opinion, that France will be a gainer by the loſs of her duties on foreign commerce in conſequence of the propoſed eſtabliſhment of a general free-trade. So great would be the conſequent influx of wealth into her market, that the people could well bear the levy of ſome internal tax to ſupply the defalcation of revenue occaſioned by the adoption of this grand ſyſtem of commercial liberty. But this ſubſtitute would be in a great degree, if not altogether, unneceſſary, becauſe, if my ſketch of the formation of the whole collective body of the male inhabitants of France, and as well aliens as natives, into an univerſal national militia of armed citizens, from ſixteen to ſixty years of age, were to be digeſted into a regular plan, and executed, ſhe would be relieved from the neceſſity of ſupporting the expence of an armed naval eſtabliſhment. Happy in the poſſeſſion of twelve millions or more of armed citizens to protect her

coaſts from invaſion, fleets of war would become uſeleſs. And indeed no foreign power would dare to attack a free nation ſo completely prepared to repel a foe; or if they did, they would pay dear for their raſhneſs. Nor would a foreign power be inclined to hazard the attempt, when it found that France had renounced war offenſive, all hoſtile attacks on other countries, and ſet a glorious example to the ſurrounding nations, by confining her views to the peaceable ſyſtem of ſelf-defence. An armed naval force indeed would be neceſſary to protect her free trade, but, as her merchants would be greatly benefitted by the abolition of all taxes on exports and imports, it would be reaſonable they ſhould be required to defend their own trade at their own expence. No doubt happy would they be to defend it on ſuch terms, building their own ſhips of war for convoys, or ſailing in concert in armed mercantile veſſels.

Having pointed out what ſeems to me efficacious ways and means to improve the revenue, and recruit the exhauſted finances of the French, in the articles of ſavings and reſources, namely, 1ſt, the gradual ſuppreſſion of the ſecular clergy accompanying the already affected deſtruction of the monaſtic orders; 2dly, the immenſe, perpetual, rental of the confiſcated church-lands, lay-corporate lands, and charity-lands propoſed to be lett, inſtead of ſold; 3dly, the abolition of the preſent extenſive war-eſtabliſhment; 4thly, a future ſmaller rental ariſing from the diviſion of the waſte lands among the ſoldiery,

diery, converted into armed citizens; 5thly, a like rental from a like partition of the remainder of the waſte lands among the working poor; 6thly, the conſequent reduction of the expence of their preſent mode of proviſion for the poor; 7thly, the diſcontinuance of the charges of ſupporting eccleſiaſtic, civil, judicial, military, and naval eſtabliſhments in their Weſt-India colonies, in conſequence of the propoſed declaration of their independence; and 8thly and laſtly, the transfer of the expenſe of an armed navy at home to the mercantile body for the defence of their projected free trade;—I ſhall here cloſe, Sir, with the ſubject of finance, my Examination of your celebrated 'Reflections on the French Revolution,' the few unavoidable and inconſiderable evils whereof you have induſtriouſly diſplayed and amplified, if not multiplied; but kept the great advantages out of ſight, if national liberty and happineſs, obtained and ſecured to 30 millions of people, deſerve to be ſo called.

Your cavalier treatment of the French and their National Aſſembly juſtifies me in re-meaſuring to you that meaſure, which you mete to them; and therefore, though I wiſh to preſerve the good manners of the gentleman in my ſtrictures on your eſſay, yet I cannot ſo far ſuffer my politeneſs to diſgrace my ſincerity, as to refrain from declaring that the work is diſtinguiſhed by an exuberance of fancy, and a dearth of argument, by a fondneſs for paradox and caricature. It contains indeed ſome information, but is not free from coarſe metaphor, and indelicate

alluſion, which derogate from your *exterior* dignity as a Right Honourable Privy Counſellor, and from the more valuable *intrinſic* courteſy of the gentleman. Unhappily, your ſtrong attachment to ariſtocracy tends to ſubſtitute for this amiable quality in the latter character the inſolence and arrogance predominant in that order of fictitious beings, when they are not corrected by a good education, good ſenſe, and good nature.

In your affectation of a richneſs of metaphor, and a brilliancy of ſtyle, you ſometimes ſink rather into a bombaſt bathos, than ſoar to the true ſublime. Panegyric on monarchy and ariſtocracy, and ironical invective againſt democracy, are copiouſly diſtributed throughout your Reflections. Unwilling to confine your ſarcaſms to the French and their legiſlative aſſembly, you have, *liberally* diſpenſing your *illiberality*, extended them to two Britiſh ſocieties, reſpectable for the learning and patriotiſm of their members. To this abuſe of your pen you was inſtinctively driven by your *terrible* apprehenſions, that the Revolution Society, which you pervert into "*a Society for Revolutions*," and that of Conſtitutional Information, which has happily given birth to a ſimilar ſociety in Mancheſter, may prove, ſooner or later, ſucceſsfully inſtrumental in opening the eyes of their countrymen to a juſt ſenſe of their true intereſt, and pave the way for making that proper uſe of the French Revolution, which conſiſts in eſtabliſhing a national aſſociation to engage with firmneſs, but without tumult, in the neceſſary work of a

ſubſtantial

ſubſtantial radical reform of our conſtitution, on the principles of the natural equal rights of men, and of their univerſal claim to impartial liberty. Sacred principles theſe, which pervade and form the baſis of our political conſtitution in its primitive purity of Saxon ſimplicity.

This probably may, by the divine bleſſing, be the final iſſue of the French Revolution in Britain. A Parliamentary Reform in the three very neceſſary points of *annual election*, and of *free, equal, and univerſal repreſentation and eligibility*, with an exception to the dependants on the crown, argumentatively inſiſted on in my "Political Reformation," &c. it is well calculated to introduce, and your officious publication originating in your fears to acccelerate. A bleſſed event will this be, which you dread as unfavourable to the partial intereſts of your beloved ariſtocracy.

The public may form a judgment of the importance of my plan of reform in the ſaid pamphlet to their equal liberty and happineſs, and of the dread their enemies entertain, leſt the principles of the plan ſhould become ſo faſhionable as to call for practice, from the following curious anecdote conſequent on the publication, which I relate as well for their amuſement as ſatisfaction.

In a Poſtſcript to the work, relating to Ireland, I had too ſanguinely expreſſed an expectation, that the Penſion-bill, which had then paſſed the Houſe of Commons there, would make its way through the Houſe of Lords, and as haſtily grounded a removal with

with my family to that iſland, on my fond hopes of a ſucceſsful iſſue to the bill. The authors of the Monthly Review, at the cloſe of their favourable critique on the work, with great good humour remark, "there ſeems to be no preſent occaſion for "Old England to fear the loſs of this zealous defen-"der of her liberties; for we now learn that the "Iriſh penſion-bill was loſt in the *Houſe of Lords* of "that kingdom."

However, neither the unſucceſsful fate of the penſion-bill, nor the remark of the Reviewers, was ſufficient to diſcourage a gentleman of the name of Briſtow from calling on me, and propoſing an exchange of my inconſiderable preferment here for more valuable in Ireland. Surprized as I was at this unexpected viſit from an entire ſtranger, and at the occaſion of it, I collected my thoughts ſufficiently to inform him to this effect,—that the caſe was greatly altered in Ireland ſince my publication, that conſequently the reaſon therein alledged for my removal, proved merely imaginary, alluding to the ſubſequent rejection of the penſion-bill, and that, if it had really ſubſiſted, my averſion to a ſubſcription to the Thirty-nine Articles for future preferment in England would equally operate as an inſurmountable objection to an exchange in Ireland. He anſwered to the following purport,—that, if that were my only objection, he thought, a freſh ſubſcription to the Articles, in caſe of an exchange, might be diſpenſed with. In reply, I gave him to underſtand, that family engagements here, and an unwillingneſs

at

at my time of life to ſeek for freſh connexions in a country, where I ſhould be an entire ſtranger, would not permit me to embrace his propoſal. Mr. Briſtow then took his leave, and I have not ſeen him ſince. I might have added, I ſhould not much reliſh the treatment I might experience from a ſet of gentlemen called White Boys, who might not only refuſe me my tythes, but murther me, or my collector, or both, for claiming them. I am ignorant of the motives of Mr. Briſtow in his propoſal of an exchange of preferment, as alſo whether they originated in himſelf, or in ſecret employers. The truth may one day come to light. But, be that as it may, my dear countrymen need not at preſent in the language of the good-natured Reviewers, "fear the loſs of" their "zealous defender of the liberties of Old England."

From this digreſſion, Mr. Burke, I return to a concluſion of my Examination of your Reflections.

You have raiſed a ſpirit of free inquiry in political concerns, which you cannot eaſily lay; which may, at no diſtant period, produce very different conſequences, and far happier than thoſe, which you ſeem too ſanguinely to have hoped would infallibly and inſtantly reſult from your "Reflections "on the Revolution in France."

Were I uncharitably diſpoſed to judge of your general deportment in private life, by the principles and ſpirit conſpicuous in theſe Reflections, I ſhould conceive you to be one of thoſe harſh, rugged, ſour, auſtere, moroſe men, who are incapacitated to ſhare in the heart-felt joys and ſweet endearments of ſocial

and

and domeſtic life. But I am willing to entertain a more favourable opinion of you, and doubt not but you exhibit, in your intercourſe with your fellow creatures, an amiable enſample of Chriſtian virtues and liberal accompliſhments, making a candid allowance for thoſe infirmities and inattentions, which are inſeparable from fallible humanity.

It is reported of thoſe high and low churchmen, Archbiſhop Laud and Biſhop Williams, that the intimacy between them, contracted in childhood or adoleſcence, was never in manhood interrupted by their contrariety of ſentiments political and religious, and in an unhappy reign too, when party-animoſity raged with unabated virulence. You and your Examiner cannot boaſt the *mutual* happineſs even of a ſlight acquaintance; but, as I am on the point of ſitting down to dinner with cara ſpoſa and young ones, I cannot leave you without indulging in the pleaſure of toaſting you, with perfect conformity to my equalizing principle, in a bumper of "humble democratic "Port." My wife will join in the toaſt, and the infants ſhall be taught to liſp it. You may, if you pleaſe, return the compliment, by drinking my health, with ſtrict adherence to your predilection for monarchy and ariſtocracy, in a glaſs of "Imperial Tokay," or Right Honourable Burgundy.

FINIS.

BRITISH 13 MY 96 MUSEUM